

The Canadian Historical Review

NEW SERIES

OF

THE REVIEW OF HISTORICAL PUBLICATIONS
RELATING TO CANADA

(FOUNDED 1896)

BOARD OF EDITORS

A. H. U. COLQUHOUN

H. H. LANGTON

W. L. GRANT

D. A. McARTHUR

W. P. M. KENNEDY

GEORGE M. WRONG

MANAGING EDITOR

W. S. WALLACE

ASSOCIATE EDITOR

GEORGE W. BROWN

VOLUME X

1929

Published Quarterly
At the University of Toronto Press

24

General
Yahr

TABLE OF CONTENTS

No. 1. MARCH, 1929

Vol 10

| | | |
|--|-----------|----|
| NOTES AND COMMENTS | - - - - - | 1 |
| ARTICLES | | |
| <i>English Fear of "Encirclement" in the Seventeenth Century</i> By William T. Morgan | - - - - - | 4 |
| <i>The Origin of the So-called Fenian Raid on Manitoba in 1871</i> By John P. Pritchett | - - - - - | 23 |
| <i>Papineau in Exile</i> By Norah Story | - - - - - | 43 |
| CORRESPONDENCE | - - - - - | 53 |
| REVIEWS OF BOOKS | - - - - - | 56 |
| RECENT PUBLICATIONS RELATING TO CANADA | - - - - - | 87 |

No. 2. JUNE, 1929

| | | |
|---|-----------|-----|
| NOTES AND COMMENTS | - - - - - | 97 |
| ARTICLES | | |
| <i>The International Committee of Historical Sciences</i> By Mack Eastman | - - - - - | 101 |
| <i>Annual Meeting of the Canadian Historical Association</i> By George W. Brown | - - - - - | 104 |
| <i>Canada's Relations with the Empire as seen by the Toronto Globe, 1857-1867</i> By F. H. Underhill | - - - - - | 106 |
| <i>The Command of the Canadian Army for the Campaign of 1777</i> By Jane Clark | - - - - - | 129 |
| NOTES AND DOCUMENTS | | |
| <i>McTavish, Frobisher and Company of Montreal</i> By R. Harvey Fleming | - - - - - | 136 |
| REVIEWS OF BOOKS | - - - - - | 153 |
| RECENT PUBLICATIONS RELATING TO CANADA | - - - - - | 176 |

No. 3. SEPTEMBER, 1929

| | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|-----|
| NOTES AND COMMENTS | - | - | - | - | - | - | 193 |
| ARTICLES | | | | | | | |
| <i>Who Kept the United States out of the League of Nations</i> | | | | | | | |
| By H. Maurice Darling | - | - | - | - | - | - | 196 |
| <i>A Canadian Pioneer: Spanish John</i> | | | | | | | |
| By A. G. Morice | - | - | - | - | - | - | 212 |
| <i>The Fate of Titles in Canada</i> | | | | | | | |
| By D. W. Thomson | - | - | - | - | - | - | 236 |
| <i>Graduate Theses in Canadian History</i> | | | | | | | |
| By George W. Brown | - | - | - | - | - | - | 247 |
| NOTES AND DOCUMENTS | | | | | | | |
| <i>Representation by the Act of Union of 1840</i> | | | | | | | |
| By G. de T. Glazebrook | - | - | - | - | - | - | 252 |
| CORRESPONDENCE | - | - | - | - | - | - | 257 |
| REVIEWS OF BOOKS | - | - | - | - | - | - | 259 |
| RECENT PUBLICATIONS RELATING TO CANADA | - | - | - | - | - | - | 279 |

No. 4. DECEMBER, 1929

| | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|-----|
| NOTES AND COMMENTS | - | - | - | - | - | - | 289 |
| ARTICLES | | | | | | | |
| <i>The Assault on the Laurentian Barrier, 1850-1870</i> | | | | | | | |
| By A. R. M. Lower | - | - | - | - | - | - | 294 |
| <i>Sidelights on the Careers of Miles Macdonell and His Brothers</i> | | | | | | | |
| By A. G. Morice | - | - | - | - | - | - | 308 |
| NOTES AND DOCUMENTS | | | | | | | |
| <i>The Earliest Example of Printing in Upper Canada</i> | | | | | | | |
| By W. S. Wallace | - | - | - | - | - | - | 333 |
| <i>The Authorship of Certain Papers in the LOWER CANADA JURIST</i> | | | | | | | |
| By S. Morley Scott | - | - | - | - | - | - | 335 |
| REVIEWS OF BOOKS | - | - | - | - | - | - | 343 |
| RECENT PUBLICATIONS RELATING TO CANADA | - | - | - | - | - | - | 362 |
| INDEX OF VOLUME X | - | - | - | - | - | - | 385 |

The Canadian Historical Review

MAR 16 1929

NEW SERIES
OF

THE REVIEW OF HISTORICAL PUBLICATIONS RELATING TO CANADA

(FOUNDED 1896)

VOL. X

TORONTO, MARCH, 1929

No. 1

CONTENTS

NOTES AND COMMENTS - - - - - 1

ARTICLES

English Fear of "Encirclement" in the Seventeenth Century
By William T. Morgan - - - - - 4

The Origin of the So-called Fenian Raid on Manitoba in 1871
By John P. Pritchett - - - - - 23

Papineau in Exile
By Norah Story - - - - - 43

CORRESPONDENCE - - - - - 53

REVIEWS OF BOOKS (see next page) - - - - - 56

RECENT PUBLICATIONS RELATING TO CANADA - - - 87

Published Quarterly
At the University of Toronto Press

Price, 50c. the copy, or \$2 the year.

All rights reserved

REVIEWS OF BOOKS

| | |
|--|----|
| WRONG, <i>The Rise and Fall of New France</i> : by William Wood..... | 56 |
| VATTIER, <i>Essai sur la mentalité canadienne-française</i> ; and <i>Esquisse historique de la colonisation de la province de Québec</i> : by Alexander Brady..... | 59 |
| BOLTON, <i>Fray Juan Crespi</i> : by His Honour Judge Howay..... | 60 |
| McFEE, <i>Sir Martin Frobisher</i> : by L. J. Burpee..... | 61 |
| BODILLY, <i>The Voyage of Captain Thomas James</i> : by T. A. C. Tyrrell..... | 62 |
| MOORE, <i>Valiant La Vérendrye</i> : by L. J. Burpee..... | 63 |
| WOOD (ed.), <i>Documents of the Canadian War of 1812</i> : by Brigadier-General E. A. Cruikshank..... | 64 |
| MOBERLY, <i>When Fur was King</i> : by H. A. Innis..... | 65 |
| BELL and MORRELL (eds.), <i>Select Documents on British Colonial Policy</i> : by A. H. U. Colquhoun..... | 67 |
| FAY: <i>The Origins of the World War</i> : by F. H. Soward..... | 67 |
| TOYNBEE, <i>The Conduct of British Empire Foreign Relations since the Peace Settlement</i> ; SMITH, <i>The Four Dominions</i> ; DE MONTGOMERY, <i>Pax Britannica</i> : by F. H. Underhill..... | 69 |
| BOLTON, <i>History of the Americas</i> : by W. N. Sage..... | 70 |
| BOWMAN, <i>The New World Problems in Geography</i> ; MILLER and PAREINS, <i>Geography of North America</i> ; TANGEE, <i>Géographie humaine de Montréal</i> : by H. A. Innis..... | 71 |
| MACLEOD, <i>The American Indian Frontier</i> : by T. F. McIlwraith..... | 73 |
| HOWAY, <i>British Columbia</i> : by W. N. Sage..... | 75 |
| DEAVILLE, <i>Colonial Postal Systems of Vancouver Island and British Columbia</i> : by His Honour Judge Howay..... | 77 |
| GOCKEL, <i>Die Landwirtschaft in den Prärieprovinzen West-Kanadas</i> : by L. Hamilton..... | 78 |
| WICKERSHAM, <i>A Bibliography of Alaskan Literature</i> : by His Honour Judge Howay..... | 79 |
| MACKENZIE, <i>Alexander Graham Bell</i> : by George W. Brown..... | 80 |
| DUFF, <i>Crowland</i> : by W. S. WALLACE..... | 81 |
| SQUAIR, <i>Autobiography of a Teacher of French</i> : by H. H. Langton..... | 81 |
| MEREDITH, <i>Mary's Rosedale and Gossip of "Little York"</i> : by the Hon. Mr. Justice Riddell..... | 82 |
| WINTERBERG, <i>Uren Prehistoric Village Site</i> : by T. F. McIlwraith..... | 83 |
| <i>Canada Year Book</i> : by Henry Laureys..... | 85 |

BOARD OF EDITORS

A. H. U. COLQUHOUN
W. L. GRANT
W. P. M. KENNEDY

H. H. LANGTON
D. A. McARTHUR
GEORGE M. WRONG

Managing Editor
W. S. WALLACE

Associate Editor
G. W. BROWN

Assistants to the Editors
MISS JULIA JARVIS
MISS A. LEONARD

Correspondence with regard to contributions to the REVIEW should be sent to the Managing Editor, at the University of Toronto Library, Toronto 5, Ontario. Books for review should be sent to the same address. Subscriptions should be sent to the Business Manager, at the University of Toronto Library, Toronto 5, Ontario.

The Canadian Historical Review

VOL. X.

TORONTO, MARCH 1929

No. 1

NOTES AND COMMENTS

THE value of co-operation among historians has been recognized for a number of years in the production of such works as the *Cambridge Modern History*. There have recently, however, been some notable developments of co-operative effort on a large scale with rather different aims than the writing of general histories. Three aims at least may be distinguished: the production of bibliographical and other aids which will give information as to the latest results in various fields of historical investigation, and which will enable scholars to keep abreast of the vast and ever-increasing mass of printed materials appearing in journals and monographs in all parts of the world; the rendering of financial assistance to individuals, especially younger scholars, who are working on definite problems; and the encouragement of projects in co-operative research on a large scale. While the sums of money available for these objects are small as compared with the amounts which are being expended in industrial and scientific research, there has been, even in this respect, a remarkable advance in some quarters during recent years. An important example of work which has in view all of the objects mentioned above is that of the Social Science Council, whose *Report* for 1928 has recently been distributed. The most ambitious project of the Council at present is the plan for *Social Science Abstracts* which has already been noted in the *REVIEW*, and which will provide an almost complete bibliography of articles and books on the social sciences appearing in every part of the world. The Council plans to expend \$500,000 on this publication by the end of 1938. In addition it is spending large sums in assisting individual scholars by fellowships and grants, the total proposed expenditure in 1929 for fellowships being \$80,000. Among the co-operative projects

of research two mentioned in the *Report* are of special interest to Canadians: research in the history of business conditions in Canada, to which \$3,920 has been appropriated; and an investigation of the pioneer areas of Canada, to which \$120,000 has been appropriated, contingent upon the securing of substantial co-operation from other sources.

A second example of co-operation on a large scale with similar objects in view is to be found in the plans of the International Congress of Historical Sciences, which held its sixth meeting at Oslo in August last. The reading of papers at a meeting of historians from so many countries may or may not have great practical value, but the last Congress seemed more important than its predecessors in that it gave promise of solid accomplishment in several directions. Dr. J. Franklin Jameson, in the January number of the *American Historical Review*, notes as significant the number of papers read at Oslo which made formal proposals for international co-operation in the advancement of some branch of historical science; and he observes that, whereas in the earlier congresses any resolutions in commendation of such proposals were likely to remain ineffective for lack of machinery for their examination, they are now regularly referred to the International Committee of Historical Sciences in which they are sure of sympathetic consideration. Several definite enterprises are now under way, e.g., the *International Year-Book of Historical Bibliography*, and the preparation, by a large number of historians working in various diplomatic archives, of a complete list of ambassadors, envoys, ministers, and *chargés d'affaires* since 1648. Although Dr. Jameson does not expect complete success in all the studies which are planned, he remarks that "whatever is done in them, by international co-operation, will be all to the good, to both work and workers." A most interesting example of co-operation in a very extensive project of research is furnished by the history of the Oriental Institute, which was established shortly after the war with headquarters at the University of Chicago. The work of the Institute is described by Professor James H. Breasted, also in the January number of the *American Historical Review*, and the magnitude of the Institute's plans and resources will come as a surprise to most of his readers. The Institute has recently been assured of an endowment of nine and a half millions of dollars, in addition to buildings, fully equipped with the latest appliances, in Chicago, Egypt, and Palestine.

Under the title of "The New Crusade", Professor Breasted outlines what is being done to preserve and interpret the vast materials left by the earliest known records of mankind in Africa and the Near East, and he assures us that the means have now been furnished which will make it possible for archæologists and historians to unfold gradually the whole panorama of the rise of civilization in the Mediterranean world.

The *Report* of the Canadian Historical Association for 1928, which has been recently published, contains considerable matter of interest to students of Canadian history. The papers read at the annual meeting of the Association at Winnipeg in May of last year are printed in full. These include the presidential address of Dr. A. G. Doughty, and are noted in the list of publications printed in this number of the REVIEW. The treasurer's report indicates that the financial affairs of the Association are in a satisfactory condition. Not the least interesting item in the *Report* is the summary of the activities of the Historic Sites and Monuments Board of Canada. The work of the Board is of permanent value, but it is carried on quietly, and is probably unknown to many who would be surprised and interested to learn of its extent and importance. Brief accounts are given of the marking of twenty-four sites of historical significance in various parts of Canada from the Atlantic to the Pacific. A similar list of eighteen items records the acquisition of historic properties, and the preservation of monuments and structures already under the administration of the Board. The list of sites which it is proposed to mark in the near future contains no less than fifty-nine names. The annual meeting of the Historical Association for 1929 will be held in Ottawa in the latter part of May.

Professor William T. Morgan of the University of Indiana, whose writings on English history of the Queen Anne period are well known, has contributed the first article in this issue of the REVIEW. Mr. John P. Pritchett of Queen's University, in his article on the so-called Fenian Raid on Manitoba in 1871, corrects impressions which have been commonly accepted with regard to that incident. Miss N. Story of the Dominion Archives staff has used unpublished material of importance in her account of the activities of Papineau during his exile.

ENGLISH FEAR OF "ENCIRCLEMENT" IN THE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY

FORTUNATE, indeed, is he who finds a good biographer. Cromwell lives anew in Carlyle's brilliant pages, Macaulay made of William III a Protestant hero, and many a Roman notable would long since have been forgotten but for Plutarch's intriguing sketches. Parkman, likewise, has made Frontenac and La Salle immortal, whereas the English pioneers who matched their wits against the American wilderness and the Red Indian with an even greater measure of success, have long been buried in oblivion, from which they have been only partially resurrected by the accurate spade work of the late Professor Alvord and other American historians. The long struggle for the Mississippi valley, although decided by a small group of men, was really a gigantic one, for the control of the vast interior of North America was at stake, and upon its result hung the international prestige of Anglo-Saxon and Latin.

No greater historical travesty has ever passed current than the idea that the British Empire grew up in a fit of national absent-mindedness. The English dream of sea power and empire is as old as Creçy. The imperialistic note became very prominent in the sixteenth century, and was particularly stressed by the dashing Elizabethan seamen, who sought, perhaps, for a commercial rather than a colonial empire. By 1600 the rising national states on the western fringe of the European world were ripe for expansion, a condition accentuated by voyages such as those of Diaz, the Cabots, da Gama, and Columbus. French, English, and Spanish vied with each other in a search for the elusive Northwest passage, which was universally considered the preliminary step towards both expansion and encirclement. "The solution of the northern mystery," writes one scholar, "was as much the cause of the French explorations as of the Spanish discovery of the Mississippi."¹

During the first decades of the sixteenth century at least a

¹F. B. Steck, *The Jolliet-Marquette Expedition, 1673* (Washington, 1927), 104; C. W. Alvord, *The Illinois Country* (Springfield, 1920), 76.

dozen Spaniards sought in vain for this passage.¹ Magellan did find a way far to the south, but this served only to concentrate attention upon the search for a shorter route to the north. By this time Verrazano and Cartier took up the quest for France, and England thought of following up the work of the Cabots. In 1527 Robert Thorne urged Henry VIII to attempt to reach the Indies *viâ* the north pole, for "there is no doubt but that sayling Northwarde and passing the Pole, descending to the Equinoctiall lyne, we shall hitte these Islandes, and it should be much shorter way than eyther the Spaniardes or the Portingals have."² During the next decade De Soto explored the Mississippi, but left to others the engrossing task of seeking a passage from the Atlantic to the Pacific (or South Sea).³ For the next quarter century, the English showed increasing activity.

Meanwhile, Cartier's voyages had aroused so much interest in France that Admiral Coligny in 1562 sent out an expedition to establish a settlement at Port Royal, which came at once into bitter conflict with the Spaniards in that area.⁴ Sir Humphrey Gilbert now petitioned Queen Elizabeth for permission to discover a "passage by the Northe to go to Cataia, and all the other east partes of the worlde," and was later granted a patent "to discover all the lands and isles upon that part of America between the Cape of Florida and Cape Bryton and the seas adjoining."⁵ In his wake came a host of others, searching eagerly for the passage,

¹H. E. Bolton and T. M. Marshall, *Colonization of North America* (New York, 1921), 23; Steck, *op. cit.*, 3-13. In 1524, Cortez wrote to the Emperor Charles V that there must be a "strait which passes to the South Sea" and should Spain find it, "navigation from the Spice regions to these kingdoms would be very easy and short" (*Ibid.*, 4).

²R. Hakluyt, *The Principal Navigations, Voyages, Traffiques and Discoveries of the English Nation* (Glasgow, 1903), II, 177.

³Steck, *op. cit.*, 17-41, *passim*. Richard Willes and Sir Humphrey Gilbert submitted proofs of the existence of this passage by means of maps, particularly that of Zaltieri (1566), which showed the straits of Anian. G. B. Manhart, *The English Search for the North-west Passage in the Reign of Elizabeth* (Philadelphia, 1924), p. 11.

⁴Arredondo, *Spain's Title to Georgia*, edited by H. E. Bolton (Berkeley, 1925), 126; Steck, *op. cit.*, 103; W. Lowery, *Spanish Settlements in the United States* (New York, 1911), 32, 212, 258, 462.

⁵*Calendar of State Papers, Colonial: America and the West Indies, 1675-6*, p. 8 (cited below as C.C.). In 1584, Elizabeth granted letters patent to the "Colleagues of the Fellowship for the discoverie of the North West passage," and with authority to explore all regions "northwestward, northeastward or northward." Manhart, *op. cit.*, 104. Ralph Lane of the unfortunate Roanoake colony wrote that the "river Moratico promises great things, and by the opinion of M. Hariots the head of it . . . either riseth from the Bay of Mexico or els from very neere unto the same that openeth out into the South Sea" (Hakluyt, *op. cit.*, VIII, 332).

some of them returning home to write of their adventures, and further increasing public interest in the quest. Frobisher and Davis each made three voyages to the Arctic, and each attempt added something to the knowledge of the area, helping fan into flame the zest of the searchers.¹ No one, certainly, did more to arouse interest in exploration at this time than did Richard Hakluyt, who insisted that discovering the Northwest passage as an "entreprize woulde be the moste glorious and of moste importance of all other that any coulde ymagine, to make their name moche more eternall and ymmortale amonge all ages to come."² In 1591 Davis defended himself against the strictures of his erstwhile partner. "That thereby I was onely induced to goe with M. Cavendish on his second attempt for the South Sea upon his constant promise unto me that when wee come back to Callifornia, I should haue his Pinnacle with my own Barck (which for that purpose went with me to my great charges) to search that Northwest discovery upon the backe partes of America." A decade later, Weymouth, incited by the offer of £500 should he pass "through the North West passage into ye East Indies," set out, and was followed within fifteen years by some half dozen others under the English flag.³

During this time Spain was increasingly active in Mexico, Florida, and the neighbouring province of Guale (Georgia), so that the Mississippi was soon fairly well known to cartographers as the Rio de Santa Espiritu, which flowed into the Gulf of Mexico.⁴ The conflict of spheres of influence, therefore, dates from the charter of the London Company, which carried grants west and northwest to the South Sea. Spanish hostility toward the infant colony in Virginia was greatly feared. "There is nothing so

¹Hakluyt, *op. cit.*, VII, 204-423, *passim*; Arredondo, *op. cit.*, 141. Hakluyt noted that Frobisher's "experience . . . on the hyther side and Sir Francis Drake on the back side of America doth yielde no small hope" of finding the passage. Drake was positive that the passage lay in the direction in which Frobisher was working (*Calendar of State Papers, Spain*, 1580-6, 76).

²Manhart, *op. cit.*, 25-7. Davis also published some things favouring further search for the straits of Anian (Hakluyt, *Voyages*, VII, 424-44). His voyages "made a much more important contribution to the search . . . than did those of Frobisher" (Manhart, *op. cit.*, 122).

³*Ibid.*, 125, 130-52, *passim*. Elizabeth actually sent a letter by Weymouth to the "Emperour of Cathia" (*Ibid.*, 141).

⁴Steck, *op. cit.*, 209-212; J. G. Johnson, *The Spanish Period of Georgia* (Bulletin of the University of Georgia, XXIII, No. 9b), 1. This knowledge was not lost in the succeeding decades. Ogilby, English geographer royal, showed in his map of America (1671) that he knew about the Mississippi (*C.C.*, 1669-74, xxxix).

generally spoken of in this Court," wrote the English ambassador at Madrid in 1612, "as their interest to remove our Plantations in Virginia, and I am of belief that the Spaniard will serve us as he did the Frenchmen in Florida, unless we undertake the business much more thoroughly and rapidly."¹ Nor was this jealousy of the Spaniards without justification, for the English had scarce established themselves in Jamestown before Newport and Captain John Smith began to search for the South Sea, which the Indians reported to Smith as being a week's journey from the falls of the Roanoke. The Spanish learned, moreover, that the English expected to acquire a mastery over the South Sea region by erecting a "fort at the end of each day's march of the ten . . . which lay between the head of their river and the South sea." Smith noted that beyond "the mountains from whence the head of the river Patawomeke, the Savages report inhabitt their most mortall enimies, the Massawomekes, upon a great salt water, which by all likelihood is either some part of Commada [Canada], some great lake or some inlet of some sea that falleth into the South sea."²

About the same time, Whitaker was writing in his *Good Newes from Virginia* (1612): "Sixe daies Journey beyond the mine . . . a great ridge of high hills doe runne along the maine land, not farr from which the Indians report a great sea doth runne, which we commonly call a South Sea." It was not many years thereafter that the enterprising English talked of establishing a settlement in Florida, for the "power of Spain will by such means be entirely ruined and the Queen of Bohemia [sister of Charles I] restored to her possessions." Seven years later (1635), the English Admiralty granted a patent to Captain John Mason for the area between 40° and 48°, including New Albion, the South Seas, and California.³

At almost the same moment when England was settling Jamestown, France prepared to renew her efforts along the St. Lawrence. Within a few months, Brulé had taken up his residence among

¹C.C., 1675-6, 46.

²P. A. Bruce, *Economic History of Virginia in the Seventeenth Century* (New York, 1896), I, 26-8, 33; L. G. Tyler (ed.), *Narratives of Early Virginia* (New York, 1907), 49, 105, 219. Some ten years later George Sandys wrote of the "extreme likelihood of the South Sea being situated not far from the Plantations of Virginia, and if provided with sufficient escort, he would gladly risk his life in an attempt to reach it" (Bruce, *Economic History of Virginia*, 39).

³*Ibid.*, I, 32; C.C., 1574-1660, 99, 214. See also C.C., 1574-1660, xxiv, 106, 119, 130, 198, 143.

the Indians, and enjoys the doubtful honour of being the first Frenchman to be eaten by the Indians.¹ A quarter of a century after founding Quebec, Champlain wrote to Cardinal Richelieu:

Possessing the interior of the country we shall be able to expel our enemies . . . and compel them to retire to the coast, and if we deprive them of trade with the . . . Iroquois, they will be forced to abandon the whole country.

From the English point of view this statement summarizes in a telling fashion the whole problem of encirclement. In 1634 Nicolet, a protégé of Champlain, probably travelled as far as Green Bay, hoping to establish trading relations with the Orient. As the French considered the possibilities of joining the St. Lawrence with the South Sea, the Iroquois began a series of devastating wars against the western Indians, which were to continue a score of years and leave their enemies absolutely exhausted.²

During the same years the English were active along the Virginia frontier, although they found it much harder to traverse the trackless wilderness on foot, than did the French with canoes. In 1648 Sir William Berkeley, the tireless governor of Virginia, prepared a considerable expedition to go into the Ohio valley, and refrained only when it appeared that it was impossible to obtain official sanction, and that he might invite a fate similar to that of Raleigh if he persevered. Two years later, however, Captain Abraham Wood, Edward Bland, and another gentleman, proceeded westward as far as the Falls. Bland asked permission to colonize the area explored, but nothing came of the matter as Bland died in 1653. In that year, moreover, the Virginia Assembly granted two other men a monopoly of trade for fourteen years and the first choice of the lands they should discover. "Major Abraham Wood and his associates" received separately the same privileges, and certain other gentlemen, "having voluntarie desire to discover the Mountains," were granted permission, provided they went with a sufficient force. As a result of these endeavours,

¹R. G. Thwaites (ed.), *Jesuit Relations* (Cleveland, 1897), V, 292.

²C.C., 1697-8, 323; A. H. Buffinton, *British and French Imperialism in North America* (Historical Outlook, 1919, X, 492); C. W. Alvord and L. Bidgood, *First Explorations of the Trans-Allegheny Region by Virginians* (Cleveland, 1912), 24, 53; E. H. Blair, *Indian Tribes of the Upper Mississippi and the Great Lakes Region* (Cleveland, 1911), 155; Steck, *Jolliet-Marquette Expedition*, 108. As early as 1640 France feared encroachments from the Virginians, who claimed to be seeking a way to the Mississippi. See the *Jesuit Relations* for 1640; P. Margry, *Découvertes et Etablissements des Français dans l'ouest et dans le sud de l'Amérique septentrionale* (Paris, 1877-1888), I, 48.

it has been maintained by some that Wood, or one of his comrades, reached a branch of the Mississippi as early as 1654, but the older authorities, such as Parkman and Sparks rejected this assumption.¹ In reaching a conclusion in this matter, much depends upon the credibility of Daniel Coxe, M.D., F.R.S., and colonizer extraordinary, whose accounts are probably more reliable than was formerly supposed. It is clear, at any rate, that the colonial authorities and some of the more adventurous spirits in Virginia were vitally interested in finding a way to the South Sea, sensing, even at that early date, the superlative importance of forestalling the French in that area and at the same time encouraging English settlements in the hinterland.²

This is, in short, the whole problem of encirclement. On the north, England was hemmed in by the French on the St. Lawrence; on the south and west, by the Spanish. All that was needed, as Champlain had stated, was to gain control of the Mississippi valley. Three decades later, however, France seriously considered the advisability of purchasing Boston or New York from Charles II, in order to gain a warm weather port. Failing to encompass this design, France was forced to work in behind the English, hoping thus to gain possession of the lucrative fur trade, and make the continued occupation of the seaboard unprofitable. Talon, the intendant of New France, favoured securing an ice-free outlet to the sea, but when Charles II refused to sell, he saw the alternative:

We must shut against them [English] the road to the river [St. Lawrence] and secure for his Majesty all the outlets of the Lakes and of the Rivers commencing therewith, in order that the Europeans may lose all desire they may feel to share with his Majesty so beautiful and so vast a country.³

Realizing this situation, Governor Berkeley of Virginia sought a way across the mountains into the valleys draining away into the South Sea. In 1658 three men applied to the Virginia Assembly for a commission to explore the western country. Then came

¹F. Parkman, *La Salle and the Discovery of the Great West* (Boston, 1907), 5; Alvord and Bidgood, *op. cit.*, 46-8, 51; J. Sparks, *Marquette* (New York, 1902), 171. See also J. H. Greene's article in the *North American Review*, XLVIII, 103.

²C.C., 1574-1660, 81, 105.

³E. B. O'Callaghan (ed.), *New York Colonial Documents* (Albany, 1855), IX, 66 (cited below as *N.Y.C.D.*). As late as 1682, Duchesneau recommended the purchase of Albany and New York, after which he said Boston would fall an easy prey. W. Kingsford, *History of Canada* (Toronto, 1887), II, 30, 65.

the Restoration, which gave an impetus to commerce and colonization, for the English nobility, driven perhaps by poverty, were not averse to promoting trade and colonies. In 1663 a charter was granted some English courtiers for establishing a colony in Carolina from 31° to 36°, extending west and "southwest in a direct line as far as the South Seas." Of the noble proprietors, Lord Ashley (later Earl of Shaftesbury) personally interested himself from the start in founding a settlement.¹ Meanwhile, the Virginians continued active on their western and southwestern frontiers.

The French were equally alert at this time. At the close of 1656, Radisson and Groseilliers, after an absence of two years in the wilderness, returned to Montreal with fifty canoes laden with furs. Three years later, they wintered among the Sioux, visited a remnant of the Hurons living on a "beautiful river, large, wide, deep, and worthy of our great river St. Lawrence."² This helped inform them of the location of the Mississippi, which Radisson believed "runns towards Mexico." At the same time the Jesuits appear to have had a fairly accurate idea of the location of the Gulf of Florida, the Vermeille Sea and the "Bay of St. Esprit."³

Immediately after this Louis XIV became his own prime minister, and, probably under the inspiration of Colbert, he began at once to interest himself in imperial problems. Three years later he annexed Canada to the West India Company, whose territory was to comprise the area lying between the rivers Amazon and Orinoco, the Caribbean Isles, Canada, Acadia, and Newfoundland. The next year he sent a strong force to Canada, and appointed Talon, an able imperialist, intendant. He wrote to Colbert:

On the south there is nothing to prevent his Majesty's arms being carried as far as Florida, New Sweden, New Netherlands and New

¹C.C., 1661-8, 126; W. L. Saunders (ed.), *Colonial Records of North Carolina* (Raleigh, 1886), I, 102; Alvord and Bidgood, *op. cit.*, 55-7; J. G. Ramsey, *The Annals of Tennessee to the End of the Eighteenth Century* (Philadelphia, 1860), 35; E. McCrady, *History of South Carolina* (New York, 1897), 57.

²*Jesuit Relations*, XLV, 163, 235; P. F. de X. Charlevoix, *Histoire et Description Générale de la Nouvelle France*, translated by J. G. Shea (New York, 1902), III, 131.

³*Jesuit Relations*, XLV, 221, XLVII, 147. Radisson also wrote of a forked river of "two branches, the one towards the west, the other towards the south, which we believe runns towards Mexico by the tokens they [Indians] gave us" (L. Kellogg (ed.), *Early Narratives of the Northwest, 1634-1699*, 61). Cf. this with the Jesuit ideas in 1641, *Jesuit Relations*, XLI, 185.

England, and through the first of these countries access is had even to Mexico.¹

With the soldiers now on hand, the French decided to carry the fight to the Mohawks, but the invasion was a failure, and the bitter war of the Iroquois against the Illinois ended in the latter's defeat,² leaving the Five Nations free to resist any attempt of the French to extend their power into the western country, in which efforts they were quietly assisted by the Albany traders.

As soon as Indian affairs had quieted down somewhat, the French explorers became active again. In 1669 Dollier and Galinée, two Sulpitian priests, started with La Salle for the Ohio valley *viâ* the Seneca country. La Salle decided, however, to skirt the north shores of Lake Ontario instead, and at last left the missionaries before they had reached their destination. The latter continued westward as far as Green Bay, and, before their return, probably completed the circuit of the Great Lakes. Father Allouez, Nicolas Perrot, an enterprising trader, and Louis Jolliet were also active in the same area at this time, and any one of the six men named in this paragraph may well have been the first Frenchman to gaze upon the western tributaries of the Mississippi, although it is probable that Count Diego de Penalosa, the Spaniard, may have seen the Missouri before any of them.³

In the meantime the English were striving to improve their position in the North-west, the South-west, and along the Virginian frontier. They displayed unmistakable signs of activity in the Hudson Bay region.⁴ In Virginia, Berkeley was more aggressive than he had been a score of years before. He informed the English ministry that "last spring [1668] in the company of 200 gentlemen

¹Margry, *op. cit.*, I, 76; P. C. Le Clercq, *First Establishment of the Faith in New France*, edited by J. G. Shea (New York, 1881), I, 56; *N.Y.C.D.*, IX, 30, 41; W. Smith, *History of Canada* (Quebec, 1815), I, 40. Louis XIV apparently kept track of even minute details connected with colonial affairs, as we find him commenting upon Duluth's execution of some Indians on Lake Superior for murdering four Frenchmen (*N.Y.C.D.*, IX, 232). Colbert was also an enthusiastic imperialist. See S. L. Mims, *Colbert's West India Policy* (New Haven, 1912); E. Lavissee, *Histoire de France* (Paris, 1906), VII, i, 233.

²*C.C.*, 1696-7, 323; C. A. Hanna, *The Wilderness Trail* (New York, 1911), 17. See also Steck, *op. cit.*, 59.

³Margry, *op. cit.*, I, 114, 137, 144, 181; *Expedition of Don Diego . . . Penalosa*, edited by J. G. Shea (New York, 1882), 93; L. Hennepin, *A Description of Louisiana*, edited by J. G. Shea (New York, 1880), 60; Kellogg, *op. cit.*, 5, 74, 167; Clercq, *op. cit.*, I, 89. Steck believes that Radisson saw the Mississippi before La Salle did. Miss Kellogg dissents from this view (*American Historical Review*, April, 1928).

⁴Margry, *op. cit.*, I, 84; *N.Y.C.D.*, IX, 67; Steck, *op. cit.*, 116.

he made an essay to find out the East Indian Sea." A year later he sent out Dr. John Lederer, a German scientist and physician, who made three attempts to cross the mountains, and twice succeeded in reaching the summit of the Blue Ridge. This traveller's account, although highly inaccurate in places, did much to keep alive English interest in the land beyond the mountains. Approximately a year later, a stray ship from an English expedition to the South Sea, made the coast of Florida, stumbled into the mouth of the Mississippi, ascended it for "over an hundred leagues, and settled a considerable time upon a river in about 33°, which enters the Mississippi on the East side."¹ Between this spot and Charleston, some English traders were now operating, notably Dr. Henry Woodward, an intelligent explorer and the personal agent of Shaftesbury. In the same area may have been found a Dr. Hawkes, and possibly a Dr. Bolton as well.²

The year 1670 marks the settlement of Charleston, the organization of the Hudson's Bay Company (in both of which some of the same English courtiers were interested), and the treaty of Madrid, by which for the first time Spain recognized English settlements actually established. Spanish fears were forthwith aroused, however, by reports that England had designs on Apalache, which the Spaniards thought was "almost in the bosom of Mexico." Well might Spain fear English encroachments, for almost at once English traders challenged Spain's hold upon the Apalachicola confederacy, and by the close of the century had practically driven the Spanish out of the Florida hinterland.³ The English method of economic penetration was slow, but permanent and efficient.

As the year 1670 came to an end, Talon was displaying unusual interest in the western country. In April, one Van Hemscherck was granted the right to form a company, with claims to "all the lands and countries which have been or shall be by him discovered throughout the whole continent of North America, entering above Canada, in the lands of the interior, and towards the Southern Sea as much and as far as he can reach."⁴ Furthermore, the

¹C.C., 1669-74, 423; C.C., 1699, 523; Alvord and Bidgood, *op. cit.*, 62, 68-70, 175; Bruce, *op. cit.*, I, 40.

²Col. Records of N.C., I, 124, 136; McCrady, *op. cit.*, 346; C.C., 1669-1674, 132.

³H. E. Bolton and M. Ross, *The Debatable Land* (Berkeley, 1925), 3, 32; Arredondo, *op. cit.*, 150, 344; Johnson, *op. cit.*, 18.

⁴Archives de la Marine (Paris), Colonies, B. II, f. 65 bis (Transcripts from the Dominion Archives, Ottawa); Alvord, *Illinois Country*, 61. Van Hemscherck had made an earlier voyage "above and behind Canada."

Recollet order was restored to its privileges in Canada, and their rivalry with the Jesuits was soon evident in the western trading posts. "Since my arrival," wrote Talon to his king, "I have dispatched persons of resolution, who promise to penetrate further than has ever been done; the one to the West and two to the North West of Canada, and others to the South West and South."¹

Such preparations brought results in the next year. The most conspicuous colonial achievement of the French in 1671 was unquestionably the establishment of a settlement at the Soo. This was carried out with much *éclat*, and took the form of pageantry so dear to the hearts of Indians, whom the French sought to impress. St. Luson, in the presence of fourteen Indian tribes on June 14 took possession for Louis XIV of the areas around Lakes Huron and Superior, and "all other countries, rivers, lakes, tributaries, contiguous and adjacent thereto, as well discovered as to be discovered, which are bounded on the one side by the North and West Seas, and on the other by the South Sea including all its length and breadth."² After learning of this spectacle, Colbert wrote to Talon:

As, next to the increase of the colony of Canada, there is nothing more important for that country and his Majesty's service than the discovery of the passage to the South Sea, his Majesty wishes you to offer a large reward to those who shall make that discovery.³

By this time La Salle was convinced that the connecting link between the Atlantic and Pacific was to be found by way of the Mississippi and the South Sea. Talon consequently sent him to explore that river hoping to find "l'ouverture au Mexique." Count Frontenac now appears upon the scene to supplement the imperialistic schemes of Talon. Jolliet was also sent "to the country of the Maskouteins to discover the South Sea, and the great river . . . which is supposed to discharge itself into the Sea of California. He has already been almost at that Great

¹N.Y.C.D., IX, 64, 72; Charlevoix, *op. cit.*, III, 122, 148; J. Sparks, *La Salle* (Boston, 1844), 16; Steck, *op. cit.*, 125. All this suggests that the imperialistic vision of Louis XIV and Colbert was beginning to bear fruit in the actions of their subordinates. This was equally true of France itself, where the youthful vigour of the king was reflected in his people.

²N.Y.C.D., IX, 70; Kellogg, *op. cit.*, 213; Sparks, *Marquette*, 172. The conjunction of the number 14 and the name of the king makes one a bit incredulous about the details of the first great show in the North-west. The number of tribes present, however, was given by Talon as 17 (Margry, *op. cit.*, I, 92).

³N.Y.C.D., IX, 89. Steck, *op. cit.*, 143, quotes a variant of this letter.

River, the mouth of which he promises to see."¹ Out of this last venture was to come the expedition of Jolliet and Father Marquette, who apparently entered the Mississippi, June 17, 1673, "passing a great river flowing from the West, [they] learned that through its valley there was a route to the Vermeille Sea [Gulf of California], and saw a village . . . which traded with the people of California."² They descended the Mississippi from about 42° to 34°, and then returned, definitely convinced that it discharged "itself into the Florida or Mexico Gulf, and not to the East in Virginia," and hoped that it might be possible to find a passage to the South Sea by way of the Missouri. In this same year the French reported that they had constructed six forts, with factories, on Lakes Illinois [Michigan] and Ontario.³

What had the English been doing in the meantime? When Marquette and Jolliet came to the mouth of the Ohio, the Indians there informed them that they were "within ten days journey of the sea, and they purchased their goods of Europeans who came from the East." These tribes apparently trafficked directly with the Spaniards and English from Virginia, Carolina, Florida, or Mexico. By 1670 the Piedmont region was well known as far as the foothills. Less than three months after St. Luson's pageant, three English colonists, Captain Thomas [Henry] Batts, Robert Fallam [Fullam], and Thomas Woods, set out under a commission from Ft. Henry "for finding out the ebbing and flowing of the water behind the mountains in order to the discovery of the South Sea." According to Fallam's *Journal*, which was accepted by Dr. John Mitchell⁴ and the Royal Society, the party actually crossed the Blue Ridge, following the Okonechee

¹Margry, *op. cit.*, I, 88, 255; Parkman, *La Salle*, 84; Charlevoix, *op. cit.*, III, 198; H. E. Chambers, *Mississippi Valley Beginnings* (New York, 1922), 40. See also Alvord, *Illinois Country*, 69-72.

²J. Winsor, *Narrative and Critical History of America* (Boston, 1889), IV, 178; J. G. Shea, *Discovery and Exploration of the Mississippi Valley* (N.Y., 1852), 230. Cf., *Jesuit Relations*, LV, 207, LVIII, 93.

³Kellogg, *op. cit.*, 249, 256; *North American Review*, XLVIII, 103; *C.C.*, 1685-8, 406; Shea, *Discovery and Exploration*, 250; *N.Y.C.D.*, IX, 121; Charlevoix, *op. cit.*, IV, 180. The most satisfactory account of this expedition may be found in Father F. B. Steck's recent scholarly monograph.

⁴*Jesuit Relations*, LIV, 187-91; Steck, *op. cit.*, 113, *C.C.*, 1669-74, 270; Alvord and Bidgood, *op. cit.*, 19. Jared Sparks jotted down in a notebook that a *Journal from Virginia beyond the Appalachian mountains in September, 1671*, was sent to the Royal Society and read August 1, 1688, before the society. This same account was criticized most favourably by Dr. John Mitchell. See *Sparks MSS.* (Harvard College Library), transcribed from *Additional MSS.* (British Museum), 4, 432, f. 27, and 4, 433, f. 6.

path to the Great Kanawaha. Even as they crossed the divide, they found that other white men, probably Englishmen, had been there before them, and upon their return they encountered Colonel William Byrd of Virginia with a "great company," likewise upon an exploring expedition.¹

A year, therefore, before Jolliet and Marquette's venture, three parties of white men seem to have been far beyond the Blue Ridge, and two of them had crossed the Allegheny divide. In the same year (1672), Sir William Talbot in commenting upon Dr. Lederer's account of his travels, noted "that the long and looked-for discovery of the Indian Sea does nearly approach; and Carolina . . . presumes that glorious design is reserved for her," with the opening up of "unlimited empires" west of the Appalachians. Dr. Woodward, working in this area at the time, wrote of a "country so delituous, pleasant and fruitful . . . a second Paradize. It lyes West and Northe neerest from us fourteen days after ye Indian manner of marchynge. I there contracted a league with ye Emperour and those petty Cassekas betwixt us and them."²

The next year Abraham Wood was living upon the Apomatack, some sixty miles from the mountains, from which base it was easy to trade with the Indians. He was constantly working along the trail towards the present limits of Tennessee. The same year that Marquette and Jolliet floated down the Mississippi, Wood financed another expedition into the wilderness by James Needham, a "gentleman freeholder of South Carolina," and Gabriel Arthur, an illiterate servant. They journeyed southward across the Carolina Piedmont, then westward to the Tennessee or one of its branches, establishing satisfactory trading relations with the Cherokees. They came, too, at the psychological moment, as the Indian trade with the Spanish had been practically suspended. Thanks to the efforts of such Englishmen as these, England anticipated France in gaining possession of strategic points south of the Ohio, and in opening up a flourishing trade with the Indians before France could control the mouth of the Mississippi.³

The French were constantly alert in seeking to reach the

¹*N.Y.C.D.*, III, 193; Alvord and Bidgood, *op. cit.*, 73-7. Byrd was Wood's rival, and after the latter's death, he was regarded as the best informed man in the colony on western affairs.

²*Col. Recs. of N.C.*, I, 208; Alvord and Bidgood, *op. cit.*, 79.

³D. Coxe, *A Description of the English Province of Carolana* (London, 1722); *C.C.*, 1669-74, 637; Alvord and Bidgood, *op. cit.*, 80-83; H. Broshar, *The Westward Push of the Albany Traders* (Mississippi Valley Historical Review, VII, 241).

mouth of the Mississippi. Particularly was this true of La Salle, who was now sent on a mission to France. Meanwhile, Jolliet's optimistic reports were largely responsible for the speedy formation of plans for the "occupation of the valley of the Mississippi, by the leading merchants and officers of Canada." Although the French were making little headway in the Ohio valley, largely on account of the hostility of the Iroquois, they continued active in searching for a passage to the South Sea, and in extending their authority into the North-west. La Salle was granted a licence to "discover the western part of New France," because "there is nothing we have at heart more than the discovery of that country where there is a prospect of finding a way to penetrate as far as Mexico."¹ Duluth was now working among the Sioux, setting up the arms of his king, "de crainte que les Anglois ou autres Europeens habituez du coste de la California, n'en prennent possession."² Incomparably the greatest feat of this period (1674-1682), was the work of La Salle, Tonty, and Hennepin in exploring the course of the Mississippi and making it known, not alone to their own countrymen, but almost at once to the English and Spanish, whose jealousy was immediately and thoroughly aroused. The Spanish colonists awoke from a long siesta, and sent within the course of a short time eleven expeditions to check or destroy La Salle's efforts at the mouth of the Mississippi.³

The English, meanwhile, remained intent upon penetrating into the region beyond the great divide, although Wood was discouraged by the apathy of the Virginia authorities. The outbreak in Virginia of Bacon's rebellion, which was partially due to the frontier fur-trade, exhausted the aged governor and left little energy among the Virginians for blazing out new paths in the wilderness. Fortunately for the Virginians during their quiescent period, the Iroquois kept the French at bay south of the Ohio, and the Carolinians continued their westward march towards the Mississippi.⁴ The English far to the eastward, moreover,

¹N.Y.C.D., IX, 121, 127; Hennepin, *Description of Louisiana*, p. 272; B.F. French (ed.), *Historical Collections of Louisiana* (New York, 1846), Pt. I, p. vii; Steck, *op. cit.*, 170-2, 187.

²*Correspondance Générale*, New France (Paris), C. II, vol. XVI, f. 2 (Transcripts in Dominion Archives); Margry, *op. cit.*, VI, 33-6.

³Dunn, *op. cit.*, 16, 58; Charlevoix, *op. cit.*, IV, 116; Clercq., *op. cit.*, I, 107; Hennepin, *op. cit.*, 212, 351; French, *op. cit.*, 7. Bolton speaks of nine expeditions, four by sea and five by land, *Spanish Explorations in the Southwest* (New York, 1916), 347.

⁴C.C., 1669-74, 604-6; Hanna, *op. cit.*, 19; Buffinton, in *Historical Outlook*, X, 493; Alvord and Bidgood, *op. cit.*, 87.

seem to have concerned themselves with westward expansion. Dr. Coxe¹ wrote:

In 1678 a considerable number of persons went from New England upon discovery and proceeded as far as New Mexico, 150 leagues from the River of Mechasipi, and at their return, rendered an account to the Government of Boston. . . . The war soon after breaking out between the English and Indians, many of the Indians who were in that expedition retreated to Canada, from whom Mr. De Salle received most of his information concerning that country by him afterwards discovered, and they served him for guides and interpreters, as is attested by Mr. Tonly [Tonty], as also by De Clark [Clercq] in a book published by the order of the French King.²

Fanciful though this may sound, it is not entirely improbable, and was accepted by contemporaries, even by so careful a cartographer as Dr. John Mitchell.³ The claims to the Mississippi basin advanced by the French were based largely on La Salle's establishment of a colony at Crèvecoeur in 1680. Mitchell insisted that the "Western parts of Virginia were discovered by Colonel Wood in several journeys from the year 1654 to 1664," and maintained that it was highly presumptuous for France to claim "nine tenths at least of all the known parts of the Continent of North America" on so light a basis, inasmuch as the English had made a score of settlements for every one established by the French.⁴

For the moment, however, the Iroquois seemed to the French

¹Dr. Daniel Coxe was an M.D. from Cambridge, as well as a fellow of the Royal Society. He was at one time one of the proprietors of New Jersey. He pursued plans of colonization all his life, and contrived to accumulate a large store of materials on American history and geography. He entertained somewhat exaggerated pretensions for his explorations, especially for "greate discoveryes towards the Great Lakes whence came above 100,000 Bevers every year to the French Canada, and the English at New Yorke, Jersey and Pensilvania." Alvord and Bidgood, *op. cit.*, 231 *seq.* (taken from *Additional MSS.*, 15903, f. 16).

²*C.C.*, 1699, 524; *An Impartial Inquiry into the Right of the French King to the Territory West of the Great River Mississippi* (London, 1762); Alvord and Bidgood, *op. cit.*, 53, 224; Ramsey, *op. cit.*, 37.

³John Mitchell, M.D., F.R.S., was greatly interested in colonial geography. One of the most instructive maps of North America, published in 1755, bears his name. (Alvord and Bidgood, *op. cit.*, 201).

⁴Alvord and Bidgood, *op. cit.*, 203; Kellogg, *op. cit.*, Coxe reported that in 1681 the "English with three ships and 150 men, searched all the coast from 100 leagues to the East of the Mechasipi to the River Plata, which is 120 leagues South West of the Mechasipi, and were a considerable time in the River" (*Mississippi, C.C.*, 1699, 525).

a greater menace than the English, although the French believed that the English were egging on the savages.¹ As these Indians became more threatening, a change took place in French administration in Canada, both in policy and personnel. In 1682, Frontenac was succeeded by the inefficient La Barre, who soon gave way to the aggressive Denonville. The latter more than met his match in the irascible Irishman, Colonel Thomas Dongan, governor of New York, who had a vision of empire, and has been termed the "real founder of English colonial policy." He saw, as did few colonial governors, the vital necessity of resisting French encroachments, which aimed at engrossing the interior of the continent, and confining the English to a small strip of barren coast.² Fortunately for England, the Iroquois were alarmed by La Salle's activities in the country of the Illinois, and forthwith decided to exterminate that tribe.³

Upon news of this design, the French attempted unsuccessfully to chastise the Five Nations, thus giving Dongan an opportunity of claiming that the Iroquois were wards of England. La Salle feared that the English would now "complete the ruin of New France, which they already hem in by their establishments in Virginia, Pennsylvania, New England, and Hudson's Bay."⁴ Since Spain had declared war upon France, La Salle planned to extend French influence even as far as New Spain in the hope of securing the valuable mines supposed to exist in that area. To that end he sought the aid of the enterprising Spaniard, Peñalosa. La Salle eventually failed, not so much in his endeavour to explore and settle the Mississippi, for all that was soon to follow, but in

¹A. H. Buffinton, *Albany's Policy and Westward Expansion* (Mississippi Valley Historical Review, VIII, 342); Chambers, *op. cit.*, p. 45.

²C.C., 1681-5, p. xxii; C.C., 1685-8, 45; *Collection des Manuscrits . . . relatifs à la Nouvelle France* (Quebec, 1884), I, 262; Charlevoix, *op. cit.*, III, 209, 217. It is well to remember, however, that both Louis XIV and La Barre were somewhat sceptical as to the value of La Salle's explorations, and the king gave La Barre definite instructions to stress agriculture, as he did not feel that these "discoveries can be of any utility." See Margry, *op. cit.*, II, 310; also *Spark MSS.* (Harvard), XCI; A. Shortt and A. G. Doughty, *Canada and its Provinces* (Toronto, 1914), II, 352.

³N.Y.C.D., IX, 194; Alvord and Bidgood, *op. cit.*, 235. The French believed that the Iroquois would "exterminate the Illinois altogether, and attack . . . the Miamis and Kiskakons, and . . . render themselves masters of Missilimakina and Lakes Hérie and Huron, the Bay of Puans [Green], and thereby depriving us of all the trade of that country" (N.Y.C.D., IX, 194).

⁴C.C., 1681-5, 671; Charlevoix, *op. cit.*, III, 274; I. J. Cox (ed.), *Memoir of . . . La Salle* (New York, 1905), 195-9; Broshars, *op. cit.*, VII, 233; Buffinton, in *Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, VIII, 344.

his attempt to add to the empire of his dreams the wealth and broad expanse of New Spain.¹

With the failure of La Salle's last expedition, the scene shifts to the struggle for the Ohio valley. The Albany traders had long cultivated the friendliest relations with the western Indians as well as with the Iroquois, and had for some years been sending their agents far into the wilderness. Among the most adventurous of that group was Arnout Viele, who had lived some time among the Indians, and one Captain Rooseboom. Dongan encouraged such a policy, meanwhile making extravagant claims to western and southern territory on account of his avowed protectorate over the Iroquois.² Fearing the possibility of a war between their frontier colonists, which might well end in the exhaustion of both, thus leaving them an easy prey to the neighbouring Indian tribes, France and England made in 1686 a treaty of neutrality with reference to their American colonies, a treaty which seems to have been pretty generally ignored by both parties.³

In the previous year, Rooseboom had proved so successful in trading with the western Indians, that Dongan decided to send out two parties in 1686, one under Rooseboom, and the other under Major Patrick Macgregory, whom Viele accompanied as interpreter.⁴ As Denonville and Dongan both firmly believed in a forward policy, they had already come into conflict on several points. Each claimed the Ohio valley for his nation. Dongan actually asked his government for permission to build three western forts, one on the Delaware at 41° 40'; another on the Susquehanna at the border of New York and Pennsylvania; and a third at Oneigra near the "Great Lake." These two English expeditions of Rooseboom and Macgregory seemed not only to challenge the French claims to the Ohio valley, but even to the North-west as far as the Soo. Little wonder that Denonville was beside himself with rage when he learned of them, and had them

¹Margry, *op. cit.*, II, 360-9; III, 49, 60, 64, 76; *Expedition of . . . Peñalosa*; French, *op. cit.*, I, 28-30; H. E. Bolton, *The Location of La Salle's Colony* (Mississippi Valley Historical Review, II, 166); *Memoir of . . . La Salle*, 179.

²*Correspondance Générale*, North America, C. II, ff. 97, 121 (Dominion Archives); *N.Y.C.D.*, III, 460; IX, 282, 297; Margry, *op. cit.*, V, 10; R. G. Thwaites (ed.), *La Hontan, New Voyages* (Chicago, 1905), I, 139; Broshars, *op. cit.*, VII, 233.

³*Collection de Manuscrits*, I, 343; *N.Y.C.D.*, III, 388, 504; Dumont, *Corps Diplomatique*, VII, ii, 141; Parkman, *Frontenac*, 135.

⁴*N.Y.C.D.*, III, 395; *C.C.*, 1685-8, 328, 438; *C.C.*, 1699, 604; Broshars, *op. cit.*, VII, 234; Hanna, *op. cit.*, 4.

promptly captured.¹ It was Dongan's turn to act, but as he made preparations, he uttered bitter complaints against the French, who not only claimed the region north to Hudson Bay, but made "pretence as far south as the Bay of Mexico." In fact, Denonville sent a force to the former area to dispossess the English, and urged his government to purchase New York colony from James II, which "would make us masters of the Iroquois without a war."²

Dongan protested to Denonville:

As for the further nations . . . trade . . . is free and common to us all. Truly the situation of those parts bespeakes the King of England to have a greater right to them than the French King, they lying to the southward of us, just on the back of our dominions, and a very great way from your territories.

In a similar strain he instructed Captain Palmer:

It is very unreasonable that the French who lye so much to the Northward of us should extend themselves so far to the Southward and Westward on the Back side of his Ma^{ty}s Plantacons when they have so vast a quantity of land lying directly behind ye Dominions they now possess to the Northward and Northwest, as far as the South Sea.

About the same time, Dongan wrote to the French agents:

I hear that you maintain that the French king might have a title to this province, Virginia, Maryland, and Carolina, because some rivers that run through them rise in the Canadian lakes. He might as well pretend to all the countries that drink clarett and brandy.³

Dongan at the same time was also calling the attention of the Home government to the great importance of the Five Nations,

¹La Hontan, *op. cit.*, I, 125; Margry, *op. cit.*, III, 495; *N.Y.C.D.*, III, 393, 431, 476; IX, 287, 295; *C.C.*, 1685, 431; *C.C.*, 1699, 524; Charlevoix, *op. cit.*, III, 234, 284; N. Perrot's *Relation*; Clercq., *op. cit.*, II, 205; Alvord and Bidgood, *op. cit.*, 235. "It is certain," wrote Denonville to the French ministry, "that if these two parties . . . had not been seized and plundered, and if their brandies and other merchandise had been carried to Missillimakinack, all our Frenchmen would have had their throats cut in a revolt of all the Hurons and Outaouas, which would have been imitated by all the tribes further west" (Blair, *op. cit.*, I, 250). See also Margry, *op. cit.*, V, 12, 14. The French also feared the English traders, who usually undersold them about 50 per cent. (*N.Y.C.D.*, IX, 319).

²Collection Moreau St. Mery: Memorials, 1540-1759, f. 94 (Dominion Archives); Margry, *op. cit.*, VI, 51; C. H. McIlwain (ed.), *Wraxall's Abridgment*, p. lxi; *C.C.*, 1681-5, 423; *N.Y.C.D.*, III, 394.

³*C.C.*, 1685-8, 498, 501, 503. There is a livelier rendering of this same letter in *N.Y.C.D.*, III, 529.

who "are a better protection to us than the same number of Christians."¹ Before he could do anything to revenge the capture of the English trading parties, new developments both in Europe and in the New York colony changed the entire aspect of affairs.

William III's accession to the English throne in 1688 caused for the moment a loss of interest in colonial affairs both in France and in England. The Dutch and English were now definitely aligned against Louis XIV, and Spain was their more or less reluctant ally. France realized the danger to her American possessions, and Frontenac, aged though he was, returned to the scene of his earlier labours. At the moment, therefore, when New York should have been busily organizing to expel the French from Canada, she was rent in twain by Leisler's rebellion, and her frontiers lay exposed to incursions of hostile Indians. With a general European war in progress, all thoughts of expansion gave way to measures of protection. The "Second Hundred Years' War" had begun; Red Indians butchered each other in the American wilderness, and East Indians killed each other from Calcutta to Madras at the behest of European powers. The problem of "encirclement" in the Ohio valley had suddenly become an international problem, in which most of Europe was interested, and was to be settled by Montcalm and Wolfe on the Plains of Abraham three quarters of a century later.

By 1688 the French, English, and Spanish had all reached the Gulf region near the mouth of the Mississippi. The French had explored the Mississippi and its tributaries; the Spanish had renewed their interest in the South-west, and the English had worked their way across the great divide into the Ohio valley. The future control of the valley would rest with those who should most quickly and permanently settle the area. In any case the Iroquois held a watching brief over the entire domain.

In the contest for the Ohio valley in the seventeenth century, neither England nor France lacked men of vision. France had Frontenac and La Salle, Talon and Duluth; England had Coxe and Dongan, Berkeley and Wood. To all these men, North America owes an everlasting debt of gratitude. In the next

¹*N.Y.C.D.*, III, 476; *C.C.*, 1685-8, 432. The Canadians were also fully conscious of the importance of these Indians, as they informed the French ministry that by christianizing the Five Nations, they would "secure an Empire of more than a thousand leagues in extent, from the mouth of the river St. Lawrence to that of the River Mississippi in the Gulf of Mexico" (*N.Y.C.D.*, IX, 321).

century France and England were to have men of imperial minds, who saw the supreme necessity of using the New World as a means of redressing grievances in the Old.

WILLIAM THOMAS MORGAN

THE ORIGIN OF THE SO-CALLED FENIAN RAID ON MANITOBA IN 1871

ON the morning of August 24, 1870, in an incessant rain and through a river of filthy mud, the British regulars of the Red River Expedition, under the command of Colonel Wolseley, captured Fort Garry. Shortly before the capture, in fact less than half an hour before the provisional government of Assiniboia "evacuated",¹ Riel, O'Donoghue, and Lépine, the principals, fled to the United States—Riel retiring to St. Joseph, a scraggy half-breed settlement on the Pembina River, O'Donoghue and Lépine making Pembina their rendezvous. Here they awaited the issue of events, especially the publication of a proclamation of general amnesty for all the illegal acts and irregularities committed in the name of the provisional government, which Bishop Taché and the Reverend Father Ritchot had promised would be forthcoming.² They waited in vain. Bishop Taché had given the assurance in the name of the Canadian government, but he had done so unauthorized. The Reverend Father Ritchot's guarantees were "manifestly unwarranted", and can only be explained by an "incomprehensible misapprehension or an extraordinarily treacherous mind."³

Keen disappointment and evil forebodings stirred deeply in the minds of the "exiles," when they learned that the Dominion government had not observed, as they were wont to say, "in good faith the solemn pledges of complete amnesty." This "per-

¹Public Archives of Canada, *Red River Rebellion 1869-70, Copy of Evidence, Amnesty, etc.*, Wolseley to Lindsay, August 24, 1870; Pub. Arch. Can., M. Bell Irvine, *Journal of the Red River Expedition, 1870*, 107-109.

²Pub. Arch. Can., *Correspondence relating to Red River Disturbances*, Part II, 301-313, Taché to Howe, June 9, 1870; *Report of the Select Committee on the Causes of the Difficulties in the North-West Territory in 1869-70* (Printed by order of Parliament, Ottawa, 1874), 33, evidence of Archbishop Taché; 79-82, evidence of Father Ritchot; 84-85, Ritchot and Scott petition; Pub. Arch. Can., Thomas Spence, *Manitoba Missing Links or the True Story of the Red River Troubles of 1869-70, Containing Interesting Speeches of Riel and others*, 144.

³Pub. Arch. Can., *Correspondence Relating to Red River Disturbances*, Part II, 321-328 Howe to Taché, July 4, 1870; *Ibid.*, 520, Dufferin to Carnarvon, September 12, 1874.

fidious treachery", however, was not the only cause which gave them concern.¹

As soon as Colonel Wolseley occupied Fort Garry and the half-breed control was broken, a new lawlessness came into being and continued throughout several months, which was, in many respects, far more reprehensible than any that had existed during the régime of the insurrectionists. A small coterie of the "loyal party" of the West, augmented by an influx of immigrants from Ontario, and prejudiced by both racial and religious animosities, cried loudly for vengeance. When Colonel Wolseley and Lieutenant-Governor Archibald judiciously ignored the clamour for reprisals, the "loyalists" and "bigots" satiated themselves. The French half-breed, whether he was connected with the Red River disturbances or not, was bullied and maltreated. Life and property were jeopardized. At least two deaths can be credited to this uncompromising and unchristian persecution, while the number of indignities, assaults, and threats of intimidation can be heaped high.²

Governor Archibald, in a confidential letter to Sir John A. Macdonald on October 9, 1871, under the stress of "worry and anxiety," wrote that "many of the French half-breeds had been

¹*The Memorial & Petition of the People of Rupert's Land and North-West Territory, British America, to His Excellency, U. S. Grant, President of the United States* (n.d., n.p.), 9. A copy of this document is in the Harvard University Library. It was presented to the library by Charles Sumner.

²There is an abundance of evidence to support the above statements, especially in the contemporary Canadian newspapers. Anglo-Canadian newspapers at first printed the Manitoba persecution stories, but when the French-Canadian newspapers began to decry the ill treatment of the French half-breed as the work of "bigots" and "fanatics" from Ontario, the Anglo-Canadian newspapers in old Canada either branded the tales "lies," or spoke of them as "little differences" of no particular importance. St. Paul *Daily Press*, September 12, 1870; *Toronto Globe*, September 9, 22, 27, October 5, 11, November 18, 30, December 3, 1870, January 26, February 9, March 8, 1871; *Montreal Witness*, *Commercial Review and Family Newspaper*, September 28, October 8, 12, 15, 1870, January 28, March 22, June 28, 1871; *Pub. Arch. Can., Series C*, vol. 1720: *Brigade Order Book of Militia in the North West Expedition*, entry September 15, 1870; Louis Riel, "Mémoire les causes des troubles du Nord-Ouest et sur les négociations qui ont amené leur règlement aimable", *La Minerve, Journal Politique, Littéraire, Agricole, Commercial et D'Annonces*, February 5, 1874; *Report of Select Committees*, 204-205, Riel and Lépine to Lieut.-Gov. Morris, January 3, 1873; *Memorial & Petition to U. S. Grant*, 8-9; *Instructions to the Honorable A. Archibald, Lieutenant-Governor of Manitoba and of the North-West Territory* (Printed by order of Parliament, Ottawa, 1871), 15-16, Archibald to Howe, September 17, 1870: 52-54, McConville to Archibald, September 27, 1870: 55-57, Archibald to Howe, December 6, 1870 enclosing "Copy of Evidence at a Coroner's Inquest on the body of James Tanner, December 2, 1870, at Poplar Point, Manitoba."

so beaten and outraged by a small but noisy section of our people," mainly English-speaking and from the East, "that they feel as if they were living in a state of slavery. . . . Bitter hatred of these people is a yoke so intolerable that they would gladly escape it by any sacrifice." The oppressors "seem to feel as if the French half-breeds should be wiped off the face of the globe."¹

Riel and his associates, during the first few weeks of their self-inflicted exile, kept in constant communication with each other. Riel visited O'Donoghue and Lépine at Pembina, and these men in turn, with other friends and supporters, called on the Métis chieftain in his humble dwelling at Point-à-Michael. Through an effective system of emissaries, they knew exactly the state of affairs in Manitoba. The failure to get pardon and the oppression of their kith and kin gave them cause for grave concern. It was not, however, until after the murder of Elzéar Goulet by three "loyal" Canadians—two of whom were soldiers in the Ontario Rifles—that Riel and his followers resorted to noteworthy action. Goulet had been an intimate of the provisional government, especially a favourite of the president. It was said, at the time of his demise, that it was he who tied the death cloth over Thomas Scott's face, commanded the firing party which shot him, and gave the suffering man his *coup de grâce* at Riel's command some five hours after the firing squad had bungled its work. Subsequent to the arrival of the troops in the Red River district, Goulet had decamped to his home at Pembina, where he continued to serve his chief to good purpose—particularly by crossing into Manitoba and collecting information.²

Goulet's murder was one of the most critical events in the early history of the province of Manitoba. The up-shot of it was the return of Riel, O'Donoghue, and Lépine into the field of action. Goulet was drowned on September 13, 1870. Two days later the trio of leaders was in conference at Point-à-Michael. Here it was arranged that a council of the French half-breeds should take place at St. Norbert on September 17 to discuss problems touching the interests and welfare of the aggrieved.³

¹*Report of Select Committee*, 156-157.

²*Montreal Witness*, October 8, 1870; *Globe*, September 1, 9, October 5, 1870; *Instructions to the Honorable A. Archibald*, 15-16, Archibald to Howe, September 17, 1870: 50-51, Archibald to Howe, September 21, 1870.

³Minnesota Historical Society, *Taylor Papers* (original), Taylor to Fish, November 16, 1870; *Montreal Witness*, October 8, 1870; Rev. A. C. Garrioch, *First Furrows: A History of the Early Settlement of the Red River Country, including that of Portage la Prairie* (Winnipeg, 1923), 246.

As planned, the meeting was held on the evening of the seventeenth. Where the half-breeds gathered, who were present, and what the proceedings of the council were, have long been questions of conjecture, and the answers suggested have been, to a certain extent, the products of imagination. Such historians as Tuttle (the continuator of Gunn), Hill, and Garrioch, refer to the meeting in vague and often incorrect terms, while others ignore it completely. Hill and Garrioch are greatly indebted to Tuttle for their scanty information. Tuttle in a short paragraph writes:

Riel, O'Donoghue and a number of their followers . . . established themselves . . . just across the boundary line, and were secretly plotting for another rising after the winter had set in, and no help could be expected from Canada. A meeting of about forty of the disaffected was held at River Salle . . . on the night of the 17th of September . . . at which Riel and Lépine were supposed to have been present; but, although threats were freely indulged in, and a company of volunteers was sent to the frontier to protect it against the threatened raid from St. Joseph, no rising took place¹.

That the disaffected, either before or at the Rivière Salle meeting, plotted another rising in Manitoba, there is no authentic evidence to substantiate. Although the sources of information concerning the activities of the leaders of the late provisional government prior to September 17 are meagre and conflicting, still, if they are carefully examined and evaluated, it is conclusive that no hostile move was planned. To say, or even to suggest, that a raid was promoted at the council on the seventeenth is erroneous. It is true, however, that some forty men of the French party, including Riel, O'Donoghue, and Lépine, met on the night of September 17 in St. Norbert—probably at the residence of the Reverend Father Ritchot. The fact that the minute book of the council, referred to by O'Donoghue in a letter to the Speaker of the House of Commons in 1875 as being in his possession, was never made public, undoubtedly deprives the historian not only of the official record of the proceedings, but of a quantity of detail that was never disclosed in any other form.² Outside of a few

¹Donald Gunn and Charles R. Tuttle, *History of Manitoba from the Earliest Settlement to 1835 and from 1835 to the Admission of the Province into the Dominion* (Ottawa, 1880), 465.

²*Instructions to the Honorable A. Archibald*, 50-51, Archibald to Howe, September 21, 1870; *Debates of the House of Commons of the Dominion of Canada*, Third Session, Third Parliament (Ottawa, 1876), 797-798; *Globe*, October 11, 1870.

newspaper reports the only source extant, and, indeed, it is a most valuable one, is *The Memorial & Petition of the People of Rupert's Land and the North-West Territory, British America, to His Excellency, U. S. Grant, President of the United States*. This document, except for two major instances and a few verbal corrections later incorporated, was conceived and ordered drafted by the Rivière Salle council, and this constituted the principal feature of its labours during the evening.¹ The committee entrusted to draw up the *Memorial & Petition* completed its task in the course of the next few days. Who the committee were is open to speculation. If the instrument as originally framed is compared with Louis Riel's *Mémoire sur les causes des troubles du Nord-Ouest et sur les négociations qui ont amené leur règlement aimable*,² and the *Letter of Louis Riel and Ambroise Lépine to Lieutenant-Governor Morris, January 3, 1873*,³ the essentials of the three will be found to bear striking similarities. If this be taken together with the facts that Riel, O'Donoghue, and Lépine were in attendance at St. Norbert, and that Riel was the presiding officer of the meeting, it would not be too risky to surmise who were the real authors.

Judging from the *Memorial & Petition* and newspaper accounts, the most important problems discussed at St. Norbert were "the perfidious treachery" of the Dominion government, and a resolve to ask the president of the United States to use his good offices in remonstrance with the British government "against the course of perfidy and oppression pursued by Canada towards the inhabitants of Manitoba."⁴

What constituted Canada's perfidious treachery is carefully recounted in the document. The first act enumerated came when the Red River delegates were sent to Ottawa, at the invitation of the Dominion government, to negotiate a treaty for the admission of Assiniboia into Confederation. As soon as the envoys "stepped upon Canadian soil," so it is stated, "two of the three were arrested and thrown into a felon's prison, on the warrant of a Police Magistrate, and afterwards, were compelled to submit to a mock trial, unworthy of any civilized people," despite the fact that they were promised personal safety and

¹*Taylor Papers*, Taylor to Fish, November 16, 1870.

²*La Minerve*, February 15, 1874.

³*Report of Select Committee*, 200-207.

⁴*Memorial & Petition to U. S. Grant*, 6-9; *Taylor Papers*, Taylor to Fish, November 16, 1870, *St. Paul Daily Press*, October 22, 1870.

a cordial reception by the Canadian commissioners at Red River.¹

If the whole truth of the unfortunate arrest had been revealed by the council, no reference to it would have been made in the *Memorial*, for then it would have freed the Canadian ministry from any charge of deception. At least Riel, O'Donoghue, and Lépine, and quite probably others of the council, knew perfectly well that the ministry had opposed the apprehension of Alfred Scott and the Reverend Father Ritchot, and furthermore that it was "unable to prevent a private individual over whom . . . it had no control from availing himself at his discretion of the ordinary forms and process of law." Perhaps they were not cognizant of the fact that the government had secretly retained the counsel for defence, but they were most certainly aware that counsel was retained and that neither the envoys personally nor their government met the expense.²

If the amount of space given in the *Memorial & Petition* may be used as a criterion, one of the questions of paramount concern before the St. Norbert gathering was amnesty. In the "List of Rights" submitted by the Red River delegates to the Canadian government as a basis for the negotiation of terms upon which the Red River settlement would come into Confederation, the nineteenth clause called for a general and complete amnesty in the following words:

That none of the members of the Provisional Government, or any of those acting under them be in any way held liable or responsible with regard to the movement, or any of the actions, which have led to the present negotiations.

Father Ritchot, Alfred Scott, and Judge Black, the commissioners, were specifically instructed "that unless such was first guaranteed, no conditions could or would be made."³ Father Ritchot, on his return from Ottawa, reported to Riel and the Legislative Assembly that Sir John A. Macdonald and Sir George E. Cartier, authorized by the ministry to treat with the Red River delegates, together with Her Majesty's representatives in Canada—Sir John Young (later Lord Lisgar), governor-general, and Sir Clinton Murdock,

¹*Memorial & Petition to U. S. Grant*, 6.

²Pub. Arch. Can., *Correspondence Relating to Red River Disturbances*, Part II, 137-139; *Ibid.*, Part I, 457, Young to Granville, April 18, 1870 (telegram); *Ibid.*, 372-373, Murdock to Rogers, April 21, 1870; Spence, *Manitoba*, 137-138.

³*Memorial & Petition to U. S. Grant*, 6; *Report of Select Committee*, 70, Ritchot's evidence; *Ibid.*, 203, Riel and Lépine to Lieut.-Goy. Morris, January 3, 1873.

the special agent of the Crown to assist in the settlement of the Red River difficulties,—had agreed to the nineteenth clause as a *sine quâ non* of the arrangements, thereby promising a general amnesty for all the illegal acts and irregularities which were committed by any of the parties concerned in the disturbances. The members of the provisional government accepted the report with satisfaction. It was in harmony with the assurances already made by Bishop Taché. Consequently, when the Ottawa officials emphatically denied that they had ever pledged their governments to such a policy, those who were most anxious for pardon held both the Dominion and British governments, through their representatives, guilty of chicanery, and hence they could include in the *Memorial & Petition* another act of perfidious treachery.¹

In this instance Canada was as free from turpitude as she had been in the apprehension of the Reverend Father Ritchot and Alfred Scott. Her Majesty's officers—Sir John Young and Sir Clinton Murdock—were also unjustly vilified. Suffice it to say that when all the evidence and correspondence collected by the select committee, appointed by the House of Commons of Canada in 1874 "to inquire into the causes of the difficulties in the North-West in 1869 and 1870" and to ascertain to what extent promises of amnesty were made, are thoroughly sifted and candidly appraised, it is clear that the Canadian government at no time made any such pledge, but consistently maintained that it "had no power to grant such an amnesty, and that the exercise of the prerogative of mercy rested solely with Her Majesty the Queen."² Had the nineteenth condition of the "List" been insisted upon by the delegates as a "preliminary step towards negotiation, . . . it would have been manifestly impossible to arrive at any conclusion with them and the passing of the Manitoba Act would have been an impossibility."³

Likewise the evidence and correspondence explicitly show that

¹Pub. Arch. Can., *Correspondence Relating to Red River Disturbances*, Part I, 408-409, Howe to Scott, Black and Ritchot, April 26, 1870; *Ibid.*, 420-425, Ritchot and Scott petition; *Report of Select Committee*, 70-80, Ritchot's evidence; Spence, *Manitoba*, 144; *Memorial & Petition to U. S. Grant*, 6-7.

²Pub. Arch. Can., *Correspondence Relating to Red River Disturbances*, Part II, 321-328, Howe to Taché, July 4, 1870.

³*Ibid.*, 329-352, Young to Kimberley, July 26, 1870, enclosing at Sir George Cartier's request Cartier's "Observations" upon Lord Granville's dispatch of June 30; (*Correspondence Relating to Red River Disturbances*, Part I, 286-292) respecting the question of amnesty.

neither Sir John Young nor Sir Clinton Murdock "ever gave the slightest intimation, . . . expressed or implied, that an amnesty would be granted to any of the individuals concerned in the death of Scott."¹ Sir John, in reply to the several entreaties of the delegates, "uniformly answered that the question . . . should be duly submitted for the consideration both of the Dominion and of Her Majesty's Ministers," and that it would undoubtedly "receive from them that serious attention in all its bearings which it merited." He, himself, however, "was not in a position to make any promises or give any assurances whatever on the subject."²

The last major examples of alleged Canadian faithlessness narrated in the *Memorial & Petition* are the many "outrages" against the "unoffending" French inhabitants committed by the soldiers and "true loil" between August 24 and September 17.³ It is sufficient to say here that practically all the charges made in this instance are essentially true. Discrepancies exist only in trifling detail.

Already this persecution has been indicated as the immediate cause of the St. Norbert meeting. Naturally when the council reviewed the acts of violence perpetrated on their kinsmen, bitter animosities ran rampant for a time. All sorts of wild ideas and plans for counter-measures were suggested. That treason to Canada and the Empire was urged cannot be denied. Somewhere in the midst of the discussion, O'Donoghue—well known during the insurrection as a Fenian with annexationist tendencies—put a resolution inviting the United States peaceably to annex Rupert's Land. If it had not been for Louis Riel's weighty influence against such action, there can be no doubt that the half-breeds would have supported the ex-treasurer. No matter what be the crimes of Riel, it is certain beyond shadow of a doubt that he never once renounced his allegiance to the British Crown. After a wordy battle between the two leaders over the question, wherein both were guilty of gross improprieties, a compromise resolution was framed and passed, "earnestly" appealing to "His Excellency, U.S. Grant, President of the United States," to use his good offices in an appeal to Her Majesty, the Queen, "to cause an investigation to be made into the extent to which those pledges have been violated; and to demand, in our behalf, that full

¹*Ibid.*, Part II, 519-535, Dufferin to Carnarvon, September 12, 1874 (2 letters).

²*Ibid.*, 394-397, Lisgar to Kimberley, April 25, 1872.

³*Memorial & Petition to U. S. Grant*, 8-9.

reparation be made for all these violated pledges, and the injury and damages resulting to us therefrom."¹

Subsequent to the adoption of this resolution the committee which drew up the *Memorial & Petition* was ordered, appointed, and instructed. Simultaneously with the naming of the committee, O'Donoghue was delegated as the "logical person" to carry the supplication to Washington.² This was because of his acquaintance with a few prominent Americans—among whom were Alexander Ramsey, United States senator for Minnesota, and with long interest in the North-west; Ignatius Donnelly, "the most brilliant planet in the political galaxy of Minnesota in the decade following the close of the Civil War,"³ and an open sympathizer with the Red River insurrection when it appeared tinged with annexationism;⁴ and James W. Taylor, a special agent of the United States government from 1859 to 1870 located at St. Paul, who for several years had persistently advocated American acquisition of British Central America.⁵ Whether or not the Memorial committee ever reported the results of its labours officially to any meeting of the half-breeds is not known. If the triumvirate were the committee the chances are that a report was considered unnecessary.

Shortly after the *Memorial & Petition* was written, Riel and O'Donoghue had a bitter quarrel which terminated their relationship.⁶ Disagreements between the two prior to this date were not uncommon occurrences.⁷ Both men had fiery tempers, and both had abnormal vanity. Although there is no instance recorded where they actually came to blows, there is not wanting evidence to show that ever so often they indulged in giving each other a "good cussing." In their last verbal encounter, Riel informed O'Donoghue "that he [O'Donoghue] had only been required in the late troubles for the sake of his G—d d—d

¹*Taylor Papers*, Taylor to Fish, November 16, 1870; *St. Paul Daily Press*, October 22, 1870.

²*Debates of House of Commons*. Third session, Third Parliament, 798, O'Donoghue to the Speaker of the House of Commons, February 26, 1875.

³William Watts Folwell, *A History of Minnesota* (St. Paul, 1926), III, 90.

⁴*St. Paul Daily Press*, November 30, 1869.

⁵Theodore C. Blegen, *James Wickes Taylor: A Biographical Sketch* (Minnesota History Bulletin, I, 153-219).

⁶*Globe*, October 18, 1870.

⁷Rev. A. G. Morice, *History of the Catholic Church in Western Canada from Lake Superior to the Pacific, 1659-1895*, Toronto, 1910, II, 60.

tongue."¹ There was a good deal of truth in this assertion. O'Donoghue's anti-British proclivities were the chief reason for the rupture. The Métis chieftain would brook no proposals which aimed to annex Manitoba and the North-west to the United States.²

The break-up of the triumvirate had ominous results. Out of it eventually emanated the so-called Fenian raid on Manitoba in 1871. The work of the Rivière Salle meeting came to naught. The *Memorial & Petition* as drawn up by the council's committee was never presented to "His Excellency," the president of the United States. Riel decided to wait, probably at the kindly promptings of Bishop Taché, till it should be the pleasure of the Canadian and British governments to rectify grievances. "Time and faith will bring us all we desire," the Bishop advised.³

O'Donoghue, however, struck out on another course of action; if less meritorious still it was more satisfying to an insatiable vanity. In less than a fortnight after the split, the astute gentleman had perfected his plans. During the insurrection he had gained a considerable personal influence over the half-breeds. Some of the newspaper correspondents at Red River, Canadian as well as American, at the time believed him to be even more popular among the "breeds" than Riel. Riel, himself, spoke of him as an "idol" of the people. Consequently, when the two leaders became estranged, O'Donoghue was able to attach a goodly number of the French half-breeds to his side.⁴

During the last week of September and the first few days of October, several secret conclaves were held at Pembina at the instance of O'Donoghue.⁵ About these meetings even less information is extant than about those earlier mentioned, yet a few facts, more or less nebulous, are ascertainable. It was at these conclaves that O'Donoghue and his confrères perfected their schemes for the cession of Rupert's Land and the North-West Territory to the United States.⁶ O'Donoghue's chief aide was none other than the "physical anomaly" Colonel Enos Stuttzman,

¹*Globe*, October 18, 1870.

²*Taylor Papers*, Taylor to Fish, November 16, 1870.

³*Globe*, September 7, 1870, Taché to Riel, n.d.; *La Minerve* quoted in *Globe*, January 6, 1871.

⁴*Taylor Papers*, Taylor to Fish, November 16, 1870; *Memorial & Petition to U.S. Grant*; *Globe*, October 18, 1870; Morice, *op. cit.*, II, 14n.

⁵*Globe*, October 18, 1870.

⁶*Memorial & Petition to U. S. Grant*; *Debates of House of Commons*, Third Session, Third Parliament, 796-815.

lawyer and assistant postmaster at Pembina. This bizarre individual ever since the beginning of the Red River troubles had been an assiduous labourer for American annexation of the British North-west. Selfishness more than patriotism animated his policy. His unscrupulous game was to make a large sum of money out of the government at Washington and to build up for himself a fortune. Canadian occupation of the West dissipated his designs for a time; but with O'Donoghue's latest move new hopes were kindled.¹

On October 3 the intriguers took the first definite step. The old *Memorial & Petition* drafted by the committee of the Rivière Salle council was modified to meet the new exigencies. The changes made were not extensive, merely a half-dozen words or so omitted in one paragraph, and a new section added containing some one hundred and seventy words. Despite the fact that the new instrument contained one hundred and forty-six paragraphs of the old document, the two modifications gave it an entirely different aspect. Whereas in the original manifesto President Grant was asked to intercede with Her Majesty the Queen to cause an investigation to be made into the extent and nature of the grievances of the Red River inhabitants, now the conspirators left out the reference to Her Majesty and directly asked "His Excellency" to cause the investigation to be made. The added paragraph was virtually an extended statement of O'Donoghue's resolution put at St. Norbert. Herein the request was made that either the Republic annex Rupert's Land and the North-west or else assist the people of Red River to establish their right to the territory and secure their independence. The supplication was stated in the following words:

That impelled by a universal desire to be permitted peaceably to enjoy a Government of our own choosing, or to change our allegiance for political and commercial reasons to some other Government of our own choice, and being thoroughly satisfied that neither peace nor prosperity can exist in our country, under a Government which has by its bad faith, forfeited all claim upon the confidence of our people, and has instituted a war of extermination against us; and considering further the vast extent of barren and impassable territory, that separates us from the Dominion of Canada, we again earnestly appeal to your Excellency for the

¹Montreal *Witness*, February 5, 1870; New York *Herald* quoted in *Globe*, February 11, 1870; *The Manitoba Liberal*, November 3, 1871; Beckles Willson, *The Life of Lord Strathcona* (London, 1914), 291.

foregoing reasons, and many others which might be urged, to intercede in our behalf, and to take all such steps as your Excellency may deem appropriate and proper, to enable us to enjoy the blessings of life, liberty, property, and the pursuit of happiness, under a Government of our own choice, or in union with a people, with whom we may think that we can enjoy these blessings.¹

Two weeks later O'Donoghue was in St. Paul *en route* for Washington on the quixotic mission to the government of the United States.² Here he was received with open arms. For over a decade St. Paul had been the centre of a small but vigorous movement in the Republic for the union of the British North-west with the United States.³ With all this the Red River envoy was fully conversant, and he made the most of it. Immediately upon his arrival in the twin cities, St. Paul and Minneapolis, he got in touch with the leading newspaper men. They received him cordially, and readily gave publicity to his perverted story of Canadian tyranny and fraud. Especially was it represented in the press that "the people of the North-west Territory outside the small district under the immediate control of the Canadian troops, are in a state of virtual, though as yet passive, rebellion against the Canadian government"; and that the French and half-breeds were not only "sullen and discontented," but refused to "recognize the new government, foisted upon them by false pretences in any way whatever," and finally that they, the people of Red River, unanimously desired to be joined to the United States so that they could enjoy "the blessings of life, liberty, property and the pursuit of happiness."⁴ Besides the several news items, there appeared stilted editorials pointing out that now the manifest destiny of the United States north of the forty-ninth parallel was in process of realization, and it would only be a matter of time till the advancing tide of American farmers would be cultivating the fertile and magnificent plains of the Red River and Saskatchewan districts.

The newspapers were not the only agency which encouraged

¹*Memorial & Petition to U. S. Grant; Taylor Papers*, Taylor to Fish, November 16, 1870.

²*St. Paul Daily Press*, October 22, 1870; *La Minerve*, December 31, 1870; *Montreal Witness*, December 31, 1870.

³Blegen, *op. cit.*, 153-219; James Morton Callahan, "Americo-Canadian Relations Concerning Annexation, 1846-1871," in *Studies in American History Inscribed to James Albert Woodburn, . . . by his Former Students* (Bloomington, Indiana, 1926), 187-214.

⁴*St. Paul Daily Press*, October 22, 1870.

the Red River mission. Certain "prominent" Minnesotans "privately" countenanced it. Who these prominent men were is a matter for conjecture. At the time Senator Ramsey was in Washington and James W. Taylor was recently appointed American consul at Winnipeg, whither he went early in November.¹ There is nothing to suggest that Ignatius Donnelly even discussed the enterprise with O'Donoghue. It is quite conceivable, however, that the prominent Minnesotans were representative business men in St. Paul and Minneapolis interested in maintaining the Red River trade which had become so lucrative in the past couple of decades. The St. Paul Chamber of Commerce had in late years taken an active part in the local agitation for the "voluntary transfer of the territory between Minnesota and Alaska to the United States."²

O'Donoghue after "some days" sojourn in the twin cities took his leave for the East. Early in December he was in Washington.³ Once there the first thing he did was to renew his acquaintance with Alexander Ramsey and to enlist him to his cause. The senator readily acquiesced in the *Memorial & Petition* for it was the best argument possible (if it were what it purported to be, and he appears to have accepted it without question), in support of the policy he had been advocating on the floor of the senate since 1867. Twice during that period he had put resolutions before the senate directing the committee on foreign relations to inquire into "the advisability of a treaty between Great Britain and the United States providing for the cession to the United States of British America west of longitude 90°";⁴ and on February 1, 1870, just previous to the climax of the Red River insurrection he had offered a resolution to the senate instructing the committee on foreign relations "to consider the expediency of recommending to the President of the United States that this Government shall tender its mediation between the Dominion of Canada and the people of the Red River district"; the intention being that American diplomacy would arrange for a plebiscite, by which the inhabitants of Central British America might freely determine

¹Alexander Begg and Walter Nursey, *Ten Years in Winnipeg: A Narration of the principal events in the History of the City of Winnipeg from 1870 to 1879, inclusive* (Winnipeg, 1879), 16.

²St. Paul *Daily Press*, February 25, 1868.

³*Ibid.*, December 18, 1870.

⁴*Congressional Globe*, 40 congress, 2 session, Part I, 79; *Journal of the Senate*, 40 congress, 2 session, 777.

"whether they desire to join their political destiny with the United States or with Canada."¹ These resolutions were referred to the committee on foreign relations but were never reported out.

Ramsey, however, did not relinquish all hope; and when O'Donoghue arrived in Washington with the *Memorial & Petition* "done at Red River . . . by the authority of the people," his interest and ambition for the extension of American institutions north of Minnesota were revived. Through a series of introductions, all arranged by the senator, the Red River mission was explained by O'Donoghue to several congressmen, among whom were General N. P. Banks, chairman of the committee upon foreign relations in the House of Representatives; Zachariah Chandler, the "Blood-letter" senator from Michigan; and Charles Sumner, chairman of the senate committee on foreign relations. Banks and Chandler, it is reported, not only sympathized with the "wronged people" of Red River, but gave moral support to O'Donoghue's project.² This is not very surprising when it is recalled that Banks in 1866 submitted an audacious bill to congress establishing conditions for the admission of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Canada East, Canada West, and the territories of Selkirk, Saskatchewan, and Columbia into the United States as states and territories;³ and on April 19, 1870, two and a half months after Alexander Ramsey's "mediation" proposal, Chandler "in the interest of peace . . . and good-fellowship . . . between Great Britain and the United States," put a resolution in the senate directing President Grant to appoint commissioners "to open negotiations with the people of Winnipeg, with a view to annexation."⁴ Sumner's reception of O'Donoghue on the floor of the senate, although polite, was a bit discouraging; he was somewhat suspicious of the veracity of the charges of perfidious treachery made against the Canadian government, and was inclined to believe that the *Memorial & Petition* scarcely represented the wishes of a majority of the people.⁵ Despite his

¹*Congressional Globe*, 41 congress, 2 session, Part I, 931-33, *St. Paul Daily Press*, February 8, 1870.

²*Ibid.*, December 22, 1870; *St. Paul Pioneer*, December 22, 1870.

³*Congressional Globe*, 39 congress, 1 session, 3548; Theodore C. Blegen, *A plan for the Union of British America and the United States, 1866* (Mississippi Valley Historical Association, IV, 470 ff.).

⁴*Congressional Globe*, 41 congress, 2 session, 2808, 2887.

⁵*St. Paul Daily Press*, December 18, 1870; *St. Paul Pioneer*, December 22, 1870; *Montreal Witness*, December 17, 1870.

attitude O'Donoghue and the aggressive annexationists in the government were not daunted in their solicitations.

It was not, however, until January 28, 1871, that an audience was granted with the president. On this auspicious occasion O'Donoghue put forth his best efforts. Nothing was omitted in the story of Canadian perfidy. The charges of duplicity and the acts of persecution were now delineated with minute detail and gross exaggeration. No longer did the Red River people ask for independence; they were earnestly pleading to be joined to the "most beneficent country upon which the sun ever shone"; and furthermore the Red River representative informed "His Excellency" that he was in communication with many leading Canadians who were in favour of annexation, and he had reason to believe that the general sentiment of the people of that whole section, which was favourable to the idea, especially in the provinces, of Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island, and British Columbia, would soon find positive expression. "Encouragement on the part of the government of the United States would materially tend toward such outspoken expression of their feelings."

The chief magistrate was not misled by the artifices and machinations of the conspirator. Though he received him "very kindly" and "listened attentively" throughout his representations, he, like Sumner, was not convinced that any tremendous wrong had been done the distant people, and that a majority of them yearned either for independence or annexation. O'Donoghue was assured, however, that whenever a general "desire for annexation shall be manifested by a majority of the people of that section [Red River and the North-West Territories], the United States government will give their case a thorough examination," but the present movement could not be regarded "as a ripe disposition of a majority sufficiently large to guarantee unanimity of allegiance to a new government."¹ Unquestionably the president was influenced largely in his action by James W. Taylor's confidential letter addressed to the secretary of state, Hamilton Fish, on November 16, 1870, which gave pertinent facts in the history of the *Memorial & Petition*.

Soon after the audience with "His Excellency," O'Donoghue,

¹New York *Herald*, January 29, 1871; St. Paul *Pioneer Press*, January 29, 1871; St. Paul *Daily Dispatch*, January 30, 1871; *Globe*, February 2, 1871; Montreal *Herald and Daily Commercial Gazette*, February 3, 1871; Toronto *Leader*, February 1, 1871; Montreal *Gazette*, February 2, 1871; *La Minerve*, February 6, 1871; Montreal *Witness*, February 4, 8, October 21, 1871.

crest-fallen but not void of all hope for the final success of his enterprise, went to New York city, where he endeavoured to enlist the sympathies of the recently released Fenian exiles, among whom were the notorious "Generals" O'Neill and Donnelly; "and through them the Fenian Brotherhood to aid him in attacking and retaining Manitoba." Mainly through the auspices of O'Neill, O'Donoghue gained a hearing before the council of the Brotherhood, at which time he presented a copy of the *Memorial & Petition* and a "complete history" of the late Red River insurrection, and urgently importuned the aid of the Fenians. The principals were informed that "though the rebellion in Winnipeg had been crushed out, and the Canadian authorities had then supreme control, the people there were by no means satisfied, with the Canadian Government; . . . that they were waiting for an opportunity to break into rebellion again, when there was a reasonable chance of success; that on account of the peculiar way in which they were then situated they could not reasonably hope for success unless that, as soon as they rose in rebellion, they would receive some aid in men and munitions of war from the outside." This aid, he explained, he expected to receive from the United States, either from the government or from the people, because, "it was determined that as soon as the Winnipeggers had achieved their independence and maintained it for a reasonable length of time they would be annexed to the United States." The ex-treasurer of the late provisional government told of his trip to Washington, and, indeed, gave the general impression that it was very successful; that he had "received much encouragement and hopeful promises from several men in high places and elsewhere, who sympathized with the movement"; but he was careful to omit the names of these several men in high places, and, also, failed to report that other men in high places with greater influence and power had informed him that the Red River mission could not hope for any support, moral or otherwise, from the United States government. The Fenian council wisely gave no credit to his assurances, and told him pointedly that he could look for no aid from them "beyond their prayers."¹

Disgusted and disheartened, the Red River conspirator now left the East and returned to Minnesota and the Dakota Territory, but not to give up his idea of a raid on Manitoba. For the next

¹New York *Herald* quoted in *Globe*, October 16, 1871. The statement printed in the *Herald* is by a leading councillor of the Fenian Brotherhood; it is most revealing. Montreal *Witness*, October 21, 1871.

couple of months little is known of his activities. Western newspapers gave him practically no attention. A newspaper correspondent at Winnipeg, in a despatch to Montreal dated June 10, gives the most definite information, and it at best is fragmentary and open to question. The correspondent writes that "the irrepressible Fenian is . . . on the warpath, and the O'Donoghue warrior is sneaking around Pembina and Georgetown, pretending to arrange for the impending raid on poor Manitoba now that her defenders [Ontario and Quebec Rifles] have returned home."¹

Towards the last of May, the intriguer again turned up in New York city, this time fully determined to attach the Fenian Brotherhood to his cause. General O'Neill was won over at once, and so "badly" was he "bitten" that he "laboured under the raiding mania worse than ever before." Complete plans for the relief of the "down-trodden people of Manitoba" were placed before the Brotherhood, and O'Neill, a member of the council since his release from prison early in February, used his utmost endeavours with the Fenian council, collectively and individually, "to get them to entrust him with arms, men, and money to form a brigade on the north-west boundary" for an invasion when his confrère stirred up an insurrection in Manitoba. Throughout all the entreaties the Brotherhood inexorably refused—it clearly saw the futility as well as the vicious policy of attempting to invade Canada; and, in consequence, O'Neill in a violent passion resigned his place in the Fenian council and withdrew at once from the organization, "saying he would go it alone." His resignation was promptly, "not to say gladly," accepted. Before the general left New York he asked that the Brotherhood "would not denounce or oppose the movement, and this request was granted on condition that he promise not . . . to disturb any of the Fenian circles with his project." The promise was given and kept.²

Throughout the summer months the filibusters were in the West privately pushing their plans. They met with no great success. Sympathizers and money were not easily attracted. A little money was secured through a series of public lectures delivered in several leading western cities, but it was quite inadequate for all practical purposes. Recruiting the army of liberation was as unsuccessful, although late in September reports

¹*Ibid.*, July 12, October 21, 1871; *The Manitoba News-Letter*, April 1, 1871.

²New York *Herald*, quoted in *Globe*, October 16, 1871; Montreal *Witness*, October 21, 1871; *Globe*, November 18, 1871; St. Paul *Daily Press*, October 17, 1871; *The Manitoba Liberal*, November 3, 1871.

were disseminated, but not by the filibusters, that an army of a couple of thousand men was on the march. This, together with a number of other equally chimerical and absurd stories, was undoubtedly conjured up in the minds of a few irresponsible souls.¹

In October the raid took place—an ignominious and notorious failure. The liberating army, composed of some thirty-five men under the leadership of O'Donoghue, officered by Generals O'Neill and Donnelly and Colonel Curley, and armed with breech-loading Springfield rifles, dashed across the international frontier from Dakota territory in the early morning of October 5, and, in the name of the provisional government of Red River, took possession of Fort Pembina, an unguarded Hudson's Bay Company's post about three miles from the American post of the same name. The "capture" constituted the invaders' only victory, for, less than four hours afterwards, a "squad" of United States soldiers, under Brevet-Colonel Wheaton, stationed at Fort Pembina, acting under orders from Washington, arrived and captured "all the 'Generals' and ten of the 'army,'" O'Donoghue escaping in hot haste, only to be taken prisoner a few hours later. The prisoners were marched back into the United States, and all, except O'Donoghue who was promptly discharged because he was captured by Canadians on Canadian soil, were subsequently indicted on charges of breach of the neutrality laws, but at the trial were acquitted on a technicality.²

Thus ended William B. O'Donoghue's grand scheme for liberating "the down-trodden people" of Red River and annexing "Rupert's land and the North-West Territory, British America" to the United States. O'Donoghue's explanation of the raid is found in a letter to the Speaker of the House of Commons of Canada in 1875, in which he virtually makes a plea for amnesty—Riel and Lépine had been pardoned on February 12, 1875—although he denies that such is his intention, and asserts that he asks "no favours now of the Canadian Government or Parlia-

¹*Montreal Witness*, October 21, November 25, 1871; *New York Herald*, quoted in *Globe*, October 16, 1871; *The Manitoba Liberal*, November 3, 1871; *The Weekly Manitoban and Herald of Rupert's Land and the North-Western Territory*, October 7, 1871. Robert B. Hill, *Manitoba; History of Its Early Settlement, Development and Resources* (Toronto, 1890), 334.

²*Report of Select Committee*, 139-149; *St. Paul Pioneer*, October 12, 1871; *Globe*, November 18, 1871; *Montreal Gazette*, October 20, 1871; Gunn and Tuttle, *op. cit.*, 471; Rev. George Young, *Manitoba Memories: Leaves from my Life in the Prairie Provinces, 1868-1884* (Toronto, 1897), 214-217.

ment." He writes that the so-called "Fenian Raid" into Manitoba was a misnomer—"Fenianism had nothing whatever to do with it"—but he claims "that it was simply a continuation of the insurrection inaugurated in '69, and with the same intention, and by the same parties." He says that his "part in it was simply that of an agent of the people, holding a commission authorized by a resolution of the Council held at La Rivière Salle in September '70, over which Council L. Riel presided."¹

When this document was read before the House it produced little or no effect; the majority of the members were still of the opinion that the "Fenian Raid" was a Fenian raid, that it was in no wise a continuation of Red River troubles, that Riel and Lépine were not implicated; and that there was sufficient trustworthy evidence to prove Riel's perfect loyalty and straightforwardness at the time.

Thus no cognizance was taken of O'Donoghue's offer to support his accusations with "conclusive evidence."² Whatever materials he might have possessed were never disclosed to the public, and, consequently, his statements have been generally regarded as merely the fabrications of a "disappointed man."

That he was a disappointed man when he penned the letter in 1875 there can be little or no doubt, but the view that there is no truth in his charges is less tenable. In the light of the evidence produced in this paper, the truth and fallacies of O'Donoghue's letter are made obvious. First, his contention "that the so-called Fenian raid is a *misnomer*" is undeniably true. Sufficient reliable information proves beyond a shadow of doubt that the O'Donoghue and O'Neill project was not Fenian in any shape or form. O'Neill had not been identified with the Brotherhood for many months; he was virtually forced out of the order because he favoured O'Donoghue's schemes "to such an extent that he became obnoxious to the rest of the Council," who were distinctly "opposed to having the Fenian name further mixed up with raids and invasions."³

Secondly, "that it was simply a continuation of the insurrection inaugurated in '69, and with the same avowed intention, and by the same parties," and that he, O'Donoghue, "was simply an agent of the people holding a commission authorized by a resolu-

¹*Debates of House of Commons*, Third Session, Third Parliament, 797-798.

²*Ibid.*, 815; Alexander Begg, *History of the North-west* (Toronto, 1894), II, 68-69.

³New York *Herald* quoted in *Globe*, October 16, 1871; *Montreal Witness*, October 21, 1871; *St. Paul Pioneer*, November 9, 1870; *The Manitoba Liberal*, November 9, 1871.

tion of the Council held at La Rivière Salle in September '70, over which Council L. Riel presided" is merely a distortion of facts, quite characteristic of the filibuster. His purpose in this letter was to prove the Rivière Salle council responsible for his conspiracy, and, especially, to implicate Riel against whom his enmity was still strong. There is not a single bit of authentic evidence that shows Louis Riel connected in any way with the grand scheme. The "head and front" of the whole movement was William B. O'Donoghue.¹

JOHN PERRY PRITCHETT

¹A. H. de Trémaudan, *Louis Riel and the Fenian Raid of 1871* (Canadian Historical Review, IV, 132-144).

PAPINEAU IN EXILE

WHEN Papineau fled to the United States, on November 23, 1837, he disappeared from public view. Stewart Derbyshire, a confidential agent of Lord Durham, searched for him in vain through New York and Lower Canada. For some months Papineau's whereabouts remained a mystery. His disappearance, however, did not diminish his influence over the hearts of the habitants, who remained firm in the conviction that "il reparaitra à l'occasion."¹ "L'occasion" did not present itself, but "incognito"² did not mean "inactivity," and the next two years were to find the former Speaker of the House of Assembly deep in projects for the assistance of his fellow citizens both in Canada and in the United States.

Papineau and his trusty lieutenant, Edmund Bailey O'Callaghan,³ made their way to Albany⁴ where they paused to await the turn of events. From the outset Papineau opposed raids into Canada, or "troubolutions"⁵ as one of the refugees called them.

¹Derbshire noted a feeling "as general as that which pervaded France in 1814 of the return of Napoleon, and Papineau seems to have inspired with the same devotional feeling towards himself the Canadians as Napoleon did the French." Public Archives of Canada, *Durham Papers*, vol. 34 (of the completed series), Derbyshire Letters, pp. 9-47.

²In Philadelphia he was known as "Mr. Louis" to all but a very few friends. Some of the refugees objected to the incognito as an act of cowardice.

³Former editor of *The Irish Vindicator* at Montreal, a paper which had been founded in connection with the Society of the Friends of Ireland. When Papineau went to Paris, O'Callaghan took his place and copied his letters for distribution among their followers.

⁴Côté to Duvernay, Plattsburg, January 26, 1838, Public Archives, *Duvernay Papers*, vol. 1837-39; Cf., *Un Document Inédit sur l'Insurrection de 1837-38* (Canadian Antiquarian and Numismatic Journal, Series III, V, 3-31). This is the deposition made by J. B. Henry Brien when a prisoner; see *Report of State Trials* (2 vols., Montreal, 1839), 548-61.

⁵O'Callaghan to Perrault, New York, March 1, 1839, *Perrault Papers*, originals in MSS. collection of Wisconsin State Historical Society, Madison; transcripts in Public Archives.

He devoted his time to interviewing the leading officials and other prominent men of New York state. Neither he nor O'Callaghan have much to say on this part of the story, but not so those refugees who were disgruntled by his opposition to raids. They promptly raised an outcry against consultations with strangers—a criticism that came ill from the future “physical force” party which was completely dominated by the Americans.¹

Just what passed between Papineau and the political leaders of New York state is difficult to determine, but in view of his pre-rebellion certainty that American assistance would readily be given,² we may feel certain that he asked for co-operation from New York. One story circulated by those who were angered by their exclusion from his counsels was that Papineau received offers from Generals Wool and Winfield Scott, but that, while he was hesitating, both these men were called into service by the United States government. General Wool's efforts to maintain peace on the border were attributed to anger at the rejection of his offer.³ But stories of this character received little credence outside a certain circle. Be that as it may, Papineau was soon convinced that the American authorities were determined to maintain peace.⁴

As the year drew to a close, the utter collapse of the movement in both provinces could no longer be doubted. The Lower Canadians, scattered through Maine, Vermont, and New York, had to decide upon some course of action. Papineau was persuaded to meet such of the refugees as could assemble at the place of rendezvous, Middlebury, Vermont.

The meeting took place in January, 1838, but the exact date is uncertain.⁵ Papineau and his friends opposed military

¹The Physical Force party participated in the organization of the Upper Canadian Refugees whose military discipline was almost entirely in the hands of Americans, such as “Generals” Donald McLeod, Rensselaer Van Rensselaer and Thomas Jefferson Sutherland.

²Prior to the rebellion, his letters to Roebuck, the agent of the Lower Canadian Assembly, in England, are full of his conviction that the United States was anxious to seize Canada and would support the provinces against Great Britain.

³*Document Inédit, op. cit.* Brien was completely in the confidence of the most radical refugees and had become a member of the Hunters' Lodges. His deposition was a great blow to the exiles; see *Duvernay Papers, passim*.

⁴Papineau to Roebuck, Philadelphia, May 17, 1838, Public Archives, *Roebuck Papers*, vol. “Letters from Papineau to Roebuck.”

⁵The evidence is fragmentary, but it is sufficient to establish that a meeting took place at Middlebury which resulted in a break among the refugees. Brien in his deposi-

measures,¹ but the advocates of "physical force" led by Drs. Robert Nelson² and C. H. O. Côté,³ and E. E. Rodier,⁴ who were already deep in preparations, were determined to seize the opportunity provided by American sympathy. A bitter quarrel broke out, and the division into a "peace party" and a "physical force" party became recognized among the refugees themselves.

Having made clear his position and retained the support of a large part of the refugees, Papineau retired to Philadelphia, where what appears to be the earliest extant letter of his exile is dated May 17, 1838. He had been working for some time at a scheme for establishing a French-Canadian colony in the West. He felt it was easy for the expatriated Upper Canadians to settle anywhere in the United States, but that the Lower Canadians, with their own language and institutions, presented a different problem. However, if nothing could be obtained from Canada, what could be better than a French-Canadian civilization founded on the old French remains of the Middle West under the enlightened colonial policy of the United States?⁵ The scheme retained an attraction for him long after he had, at the solicitations of his friends who could not bear so patent an admission of failure, abandoned it as a practical measure.⁶

Another consideration that made him slow to act was the hope that Lord Durham would be able to solve the problem of Canadian

tion places it on January 1, 1838. T. S. Brown in a letter dated Middlebury, January 21, 1838 (*Duvernay Papers*, vol. 1837-1839), says that Papineau had already gone to Philadelphia. But a letter from Côté to Duvernay, Plattsburgh, January 26, 1838, shows that R. Nelson and Côté were trying to induce Papineau to come there to meet the refugees, and speaks as though he were still at Albany. Finally an intercepted letter of Robert Nelson (see Kingsford, *History of Canada*, X, 109-110) makes it certain that a break with Papineau had taken place before the date thereof, February 25, 1838.

¹His constant opinion was that military action, unless supported by the United States, was madness. It subjected the habitant to reprisals from the soldiers and volunteers and endangered the prisoners. However, it was a principle with him not to denounce anyone who worked, however mistakenly, for the good of Canada.

²Leader of the second rebellion.

³One of the least reputable of the exiles. Before the rebellion he had been active in forcing the militia officers to resign their commissions. His efforts to "unmask Papineau" were regarded with disgust by his fellow plotters, who felt that his character would rob the "revelations" of their efficacy.

⁴A former member of the Assembly who was completely under the influence of French Revolutionary philosophy. Later he quarrelled with Nelson and Côté, partly because of their attacks on Papineau.

⁵Papineau to Roebuck, Philadelphia, May 17, 1838, *Roebuck Papers*, vol. "Letters from Papineau to Roebuck."

⁶Same to same, Paris, March 13, 1839, *ibid.*

affairs. As far as Papineau and a large number of the refugees were concerned, Lord Durham's advent was favourably regarded. In a letter to Roebuck, Papineau outlined the basis upon which "the Dictator" might be able to reach a more satisfactory solution than would have been possible even if matters had been left to the Assembly. First and foremost was a general amnesty; then a policy that included such measures as the abolition of sinecures, reform of the law, raising the judiciary above politics, and preparing the way for the abolition of seigniorial tenure.¹ The last point is of special interest, for one of the calumnies spread by the "physical force" party in their attempts to discredit Papineau was that he had deserted them for selfish reasons, among them the fear of losing his seigniori of Petite Nation. But J. B. Bouthillier, who had been present at Middlebury, declared that Papineau had indeed opposed the arbitrary abolition of seigniorial rights, but had promised to be bound by the wishes of the majority and to relinquish his own voluntarily.² As a matter of fact, Papineau tried to sell his seigniori. Hoping that someone in England would buy it, he sent full details to Roebuck.³ He stressed the benefits of free tenure as compared with seigniorial, but said he would never make the change himself as he regarded the Tenures Act as an invasion of the rights of the Assembly by the Imperial parliament.

Papineau did not remain long at Philadelphia, but moved to Saratoga Springs, New York, where he was established with his family by June 14, 1838.⁴ Between October 3 and November 22, he returned to Albany,⁵ where he remained until he sailed for France in February, 1839. The colony in the West was abandoned for schemes more directly connected with refugee politics.

The anger roused by Lord Durham's administration had caused a recasting of refugee opinion. The first disappointment was Durham's ordinance of June 28, 1838. Hopes of a general amnesty had run high among the refugees, especially in view of the approaching coronation of Queen Victoria, so that the ex-

¹Same to same, Philadelphia, May 17, 1839, *ibid.*

²Bouthillier to Perrault, June 17, 1838: *Duvernay Papers*, vol. 1837-39.

³Papineau to Roebuck, Paris, September 20, 1839, *Roebuck Papers*, vol. "Letters of Papineau to Roebuck."

⁴Lafontaine to Chapman, New York, June 14, 1838, Public Archives, *Chapman Papers*.

⁵O'Callaghan to Falconer and others, Saratoga Springs, October 3, 1838, and O'Callaghan to Chapman, New York, November 22, 1838, *ibid.*

clusion from that measure of eight prisoners sent to Bermuda and sixteen refugees exiled under pain of death was regarded as unwarranted severity and flagrant injustice. The legal irregularities of the ordinance have been discussed many times and were sufficient to cause a speedy disallowance. The refugees were especially angry at the haphazard manner in which those banished seemed to have been selected. Papineau, O'Callaghan, and T. S. Brown¹ might have been exiled with reason, but many of the others were of small consequence. Louis Perrault, for example, had been in the United States securing new type, almost ever since his press had been destroyed in the riot at Montreal, on November 6, 1838. True, before that date he had been active in recruiting for the "Sons of Liberty," but his partner André Ouimet, president of that society, was released on bail.² What made matters worse was that the authorities had not even seen that the names of their victims were correct. Jerry Ryan, who had been in Quebec for some time, was obliged to take to himself the penalty imposed on "John Ryan, fils", while even such a prominent man as Edmund Bailey O'Callaghan found himself rechristened "Edmund Burke" O'Callaghan.³

Those who had expected so much from Lord Durham's administration, saw in it nothing but the triumph of two of their bitterest enemies. Adam Thom⁴ found a place upon a commission of enquiry, and the plan of union sponsored by Edward Ellice⁵ in 1822 was once more brought to the fore. As soon as Lord Durham's intention to recommend union became known to the refugees, all confidence in him was dissipated.

As Papineau and his friends now viewed the situation, there were three possible solutions of the Canadian problem.⁶ Reconciliation with Britain was impossible; separation alone would suffice. This might be brought about by the voluntary consent

¹General of the "Sons of Liberty." He was in command at St. Charles.

²*Return of Persons imprisoned in Lower Canada, charged with Treason, etc., since 1st November, 1839. Ordered by the House of Commons to be Printed, 15 April 1840*, p. 15.

³O'Callaghan to Perrault, New York, November 13, 1838, *Roebuck Papers*, vol. "Letters from Papineau to Roebuck."

⁴He had attacked the French Canadians in the "Anti-Gallic Letters" published in Montreal, 1836.

⁵English merchant and member of Parliament who had spent some time in Canada, where he engaged in the fur-trade. He acquired the seignior of Beauharnois.

⁶*Roebuck Papers*, vol. "Letters from Papineau to Roebuck," *passim*; O'Callaghan to Perrault, New York, January 22, 1839, and Papineau to Perrault, Albany, January 7, 1839, *Perrault Papers*.

of Great Britain; by representations on the part of France, based on the Treaty of 1763; or by war with the United States.¹ The Maine boundary dispute might cause the last, but steps would have to be taken to see what could be obtained by the other methods. Accordingly, after much deliberation, Papineau set out for Paris to bring the matter to the attention of the French, and also to concert with the British "philosophic radicals" who were doing their best to assist Canada and the exiles.²

So far as the public effect was concerned, Papineau had little confidence in the success of his mission;³ but he was glad to be of service to his fellow exiles, and also it gave him pleasure to revisit his friends, who for some time past had been urging him to settle with them in Paris. The French ambassador to the United States was very friendly and encouraged him to go.⁴ The consul at New York, however, would not issue a passport for fear of offending the English consul, Buchanan,⁵ but did give him a letter to the French authorities. So, after counselling discretion to his friends, Papineau set sail for France early in February, 1839.⁶ The lack of a passport held him up for several wearisome days at Havre; permission to proceed to Paris did not reach him till March 7.⁷

French politics had, meanwhile, taken a turn disastrous to Canadian interests. As a result of the elections of March 2, 1839, the liberal groups obtained a majority in the chamber. Molé,

¹W. S. Young in a letter to Lord Durham, dated New York, October 5, 1838, recounts a conversation with the mayor of New York. He told Young that Papineau had called on him, and remarked on the inactivity of the Americans in the *Caroline* affair. The mayor declared that he had promptly warned Papineau not to attempt any agitation as it would be put down and he with it. *Durham Papers*, vol. I, sec. 4, p. 741.

²Papineau to Perrault, Albany, January 7, and February 3, 1839; O'Callaghan to Perrault, New York, February 13, 1839, *Perrault Papers*.

³O'Callaghan to Perrault, New York, February 24, 1839, *ibid*.

⁴This was M. De Pontois who travelled in Canada during the summer of 1837. For his opinion of Papineau and the Rebellion, see *M. De Pontois et La Rébellion des Canadiens Français* (Nova Francia, III, No. 4, 238-249, to be continued). See also Papineau to Roebuck, Saratoga Springs, September 28 and 30, 1838, *Roebuck Papers*, vol. "Letters from Papineau to Roebuck."

⁵Same to same, Paris, March 13, 1839, *ibid*.

⁶The story of Papineau's mission to Paris is to be read in his letters from Paris. These are to be found in the *Roebuck Papers*, *O'Callaghan Papers*, *Bourassa Papers*, and *Perrault Papers*, all of which, either in the originals or in copies, may be consulted in the Public Archives.

⁷Papineau to Madame Papineau, Havre, March 7, 1839 (copy by O'Callaghan), *Perrault Papers*.

who was regarded with distrust by England, resigned on March 8, and Sault, who had received a tremendous ovation at the coronation of Queen Victoria, was asked to form a ministry. It was thought that France would now strengthen the alliance with England to offset Russia and Austria. Besides, the whole political situation of France was one of turmoil. Papineau speculated on a future revolution, and realized that under the circumstances the case of Canada could not command the whole-hearted support of the deputies.

Papineau had no cause to complain about his reception. The liberals welcomed him and wished to give a dinner in his honour, but he refused this lest it should cost Lower Canada the few friends who remained to her in England. He accepted willingly the hospitality of individuals who invited the leading deputies and merchants to meet him, and in whose drawing rooms he could speak with "beaucoup de vivacité" on the sad fate of the province which had been torn from France. His audience listened and approved, but did nothing. As time passed hope gave way to bitter disappointment until, as he confided to O'Callaghan, M. Lafitte was the only deputy "assez honnête et assez sensible pour goûter vos sentiments et les miens au sujet de nos infortunés compatriotes."¹

Amid his activities in France, Papineau did not lose sight of his mission to the radicals in England. The object was to secure the independence of Canada by joint action in both Houses of parliament. Lord Brougham was to make the motion in the Lords and John Temple Leader² in the Commons. Both men were to visit Paris during the Easter recess of 1839 to discuss Canadian affairs with Papineau.

But in fact parliament had, for some time past, listened with impatience to the separatist doctrines of the radicals and they themselves realized the utter futility of making such a motion.³

¹Papineau to O'Callaghan, Paris, May 5, 1843, Public Archives, *O'Callaghan Papers* (Originals in the Library of Congress, Washington).

²Roebuck, the agent of the Assembly, had lost his seat in parliament. As Joseph Hume was busy with the affairs of Upper Canada, Leader was chosen to make the motion.

³See *Hansard* for the violent opposition aroused every time any of the radicals declared that the colonies should be abandoned. As a matter of fact the decade 1830-40 marks a new development in British opinion on the colonies. A study of the leading newspapers and magazines reveals an increasing faith in their value; only the radicals clung to the old doctrine of Adam Smith. One of the most interesting features is the growth of British investments in the colonies, which was bound to be the death blow of the old fatalistic views.

Leader kept his appointment, but, when this step was proposed, he pointed out that so unpopular an action would place the friends of Canada in such a minority that the ministers would be able to carry even more severe measures for dealing with the recalcitrant colonies. Papineau would not listen. He felt that the nadir had been reached, and only the boldest measures were justifiable. Both Leader and his companion, Joseph Hume, left without giving any promise. Papineau realized that Hume would vote for the ministry, but for a short time he thought that he might have carried the day with Leader.

Lord Brougham's conduct was even less satisfactory. Papineau had set his heart upon talking the matter over with Brougham. He had even consulted Roebuck as to the best method of procedure. His preparations were in vain, for, although Lord Brougham went to Paris, he was so alarmed by English public opinion that he refused to see Papineau. He sent regrets by Leader, pleading his position of judge and his conviction that he could be of much greater service to the cause if he could say he had not been in consultation with the Canadian refugees. Papineau was shocked at what he called the "Talleyrandisme"¹ of Brougham, and his opinion of his lordship sank rapidly. The vision of a British political party devoted to the cause of Canadian independence vanished into thin air.

There remained the French press; but here Papineau obtained little co-operation. The editors, it would appear, had no sympathy for his conviction that the freedom and development of Canada could be obtained only under the direction of the United States.² Besides, Papineau was an absolute failure as an author. He was engaged at this time on his *Histoire de l'Insurrection du Canada*, which was published in 1839.³ Although purporting to be an answer to Lord Durham's *Report*, it is in reality nothing but a tirade against the enemies of the French Canadians, and a confession of faith in Canada's ultimate destiny as part of a great confederation of the United States of America.

Meanwhile, some of the refugees grew impatient. One group,

¹"Je lui ai fait dire que . . . je pouvais lui apprendre quelque chose sur . . . Canada, et qu'il était de son devoir comme homme d'état, de ne pas perdre l'occasion de se mettre pleinement au fait d'une cause qu'il allait juger. Il a déplu aux libéraux français. Il a dîné avec le Roi; a paru courtisan; a fait du Talleyrandisme en parlant diversement en diverses occasions." April 15, 1839 (copy by O'Callaghan in letter to Dr. Wolfred Nelson, Albany, April 27, 1839), *Perrault Papers*.

²Gauvin to Duvernay, Paris, November 27, 1839, *Duvernay Papers*, 1839-42.

³Printed in Burlington, Vt., at the press of Ludger Duvernay.

headed by Ludger Duvernay,¹ which stood midway between the two divisions of Lower Canadian refugees, determined to discover just how serious were Papineau's efforts to secure independence, what he was doing, and what was his position in Paris. The first reports came from Dr. Duchesnois,² and later from Henry A. Gauvin,³ both of whom were in Paris by the end of 1839. The official emissary, the Rev. Etienne Chartier,⁴ was in Paris in April, 1840, and determined to have an understanding with his erstwhile chief. He bluntly stated the distrust of those who sent him, but was overwhelmed by the mildness and courtesy displayed by Papineau, who listened attentively, promised him categorical answers, and sent him away to write a glowing account of Papineau's popularity, industry, and devotion to the cause.⁵

Even Papineau was at last convinced of the futility of his efforts. The only hope was that war might arise with the United States, or even, as a result of the Mehemet Ali troubles, with France.⁶ This last contingency would lead to the recall of the troops from Canada, and give the people a chance to arm themselves and so to establish a government more to their liking. These eventualities are discussed with more moderation than one expects from Papineau. That the strain of the long years of conflict had begun to tell on him physically was made apparent by the portrait which Maurin published in Paris about 1842.⁷ For the time being, he was thoroughly tired of politics, and was glad to turn his attention to copying documents connected with the early history of Canada. For this purpose he received what he regarded as an unusual permission to consult the French Archives. He also allowed himself a trip to Italy.⁸

¹Former editor of *La Minerve*; during part of 1839 he published a paper, *Le Canadien*, at Burlington, Vt. It was intended to be a French counterpart of Mackenzie's *Gazette*. Papineau disapproved of its anti-clericalism, as he felt it was a pity to touch subjects upon which there was a division of opinion among the refugees.

²At a public meeting in 1837 he had torn up Lord Gosford's proclamation against disloyal meetings, but a jury had refused to convict him.

³One of those exiled to Bermuda. He had been one of the six chiefs of sections of the Sons of Liberty. During 1838 he and Dr. Duchesnois had gone from place to place trying to collect funds to relieve the destitute refugees.

⁴The only priest banished under the proclamation of June 28, 1838.

⁵Gauvin to Duvernay, Paris, April 6, 1840, *Duvernay Papers*, vol. 1832-41.

⁶Papineau-dit-Montigny to Duvernay, Saratoga Springs, October 30, 1840, *Duvernay Papers*, vol. 1839-41.

⁷Girouard to D. B. Papineau, St. Benoit, February, 1843, Public Archives, *Bourassa Papers*.

⁸Papineau to Denis B. Papineau, Paris, November 29, 1843, *ibid*.

No doubt he would have settled down in Paris had it not been for his wife's health and his financial embarrassments. In 1843, Madame Papineau, who had suffered from ill health during almost the whole period of their stay in Paris, returned to America. By this time a *nolle-prosequi*¹ had been entered on behalf of Papineau, and there was no reason why he should not return to Canada. The legal action delighted him, but his distrust of the system of government, which had followed the Act of Union, rendered the prospect of life in Canada most unattractive.² But, as he had failed to sell the seignior, return was a necessity. In August, 1845, he said good-bye to Paris. He first went to London in hopes of seeing Roebuck, who, however, was not in town. Exactly a month later, he wrote announcing his arrival at Halifax,³ and on September 27, 1845, he set foot once more in Lower Canada.⁴

So closed a period during which he had worked hard, if unsuccessfully, for the good of Canada. Paris had been no mere refuge in which to while away the tedium of exile. He had gone there with a definite purpose, and made many efforts to achieve it. But, as utter weariness deadened the bitterness of defeat, he gave himself up to his love of France and adopted the philosophy of his Parisian friends. The *Revue de Progrès*, to which he had been a contributor, was the organ of those radical and republican ideas that thrived in the revolution-wrecked France of the early nineteenth century. For Papineau, they filled the vacuum created by his inability to be of service after 1839. By 1845, he was completely dominated by this French philosophy which coloured his subsequent career as "godfather" of the Parti Rouge.⁵

NORAH STORY

¹The story of Lafontaine's efforts to secure a pardon for Papineau is told by La Bruère in *La Revue Canadienne*, New Series, XVIII, 1916, 516-21.

²His opinions on this subject are well known from his later political career. See also *O'Callaghan Papers*.

³Papineau to Roebuck, Halifax, 17^{bre}, 1845, *Roebuck Papers*, vol. 1845. In this letter he says that for the time being he will not consider offers for the seignior. Before sailing for Canada, Papineau spent a few days visiting some friends in Ireland.

⁴*La Minerve*, September 29, 1845.

⁵His influence on this party has been evaluated by W. S. Wallace in *The Canadian Magazine*, XXXVI, 1911, 163-167.

CORRESPONDENCE

PROFESSOR MORTON AND LA VÉRENDRYE

Ottawa, Ontario
15th January, 1929

THE EDITOR,
CANADIAN HISTORICAL REVIEW,
TORONTO.

Dear Sir,

I have read with interest, and a certain amount of bewilderment, the article by Professor Morton in the December number of the *REVIEW*. Elsewhere in the same number a reviewer reminds us that "biography is at the present time in revolt against hero-worship." Professor Morton seems to have joined the ranks of the iconoclasts. In revolt against what he calls "the prevailing adoration of La Vérendrye," he sets himself to prove from the documents that the feet of this idol are mere clay. And yet I am not at all sure that that is a correct statement of his point of view. Perhaps it would be fairer to say that Professor Morton would pull down the idol of La Vérendrye the explorer, and replace it with a much more modest representation of La Vérendrye the builder of trading posts.

At the outset he offers us three views of La Vérendrye: the first, that of the man himself (or at any rate what Professor Morton conceives to have been his view of his purpose) that he was primarily, the "commandant of the western posts"; the second, that of the minister of the colonies, Maurepas, that he was "the fur-trader masquerading as an explorer"; and the third, that of the governor, Beauharnois, that he was "the explorer eagerly seeking for the Western Sea but held back by untoward events."

In the first place, is there any reason for assuming these three views? So far as those of Maurepas and Beauharnois are concerned, the documents in the case entirely support Professor Morton's interpretation; but I confess I cannot follow his argument as to La Vérendrye's admission of his own motives. It is based upon three superscriptions of

journals. In one of these La Vérendrye does, indeed, speak of himself as "Commandant of the Posts of the West," but that is a very frail foundation upon which to build such a far-reaching argument. One may be permitted to suggest that it means nothing more than it says, and that it has no material bearing upon La Vérendrye's main purpose in the West. The other two superscriptions, which are supposed to support Professor Morton's thesis, distinctly set forth La Verendrye's purpose as "the discovery of the Western Sea." If Professor Morton can find some esoteric meaning in these seemingly plain words, I confess it is beyond my limited understanding. On the other hand, putting aside these superscriptions, and basing one's judgment upon the whole body of journals and correspondence relating to La Vérendrye's western discoveries, it would, I submit, be very easy to prove that La Vérendrye's own conception of his mission is in substantial agreement with that of Beauharnois. As to the contrasting views of Maurepas and Beauharnois, knowing what one does know of the character and environment of the two men and their opportunities of getting at the truth, their respective points of view seem to be very much what one would expect.

A curious impression one gets from Professor Morton's article is that Maurepas and Old France were eager for the discovery of the Western Sea, and that Beauharnois and New France used that eagerness as a pretext for the building up of trade in opposition to the Hudson's Bay Company. "It is hard," he says, "to avoid the inference that Beauharnois has carefully gilded his despatch with hope of the discovery of the Western Sea in order to secure assent to his establishing a new post which would increase the trade of the colony." I find it very difficult to read that inference into the despatch, and, on the other hand, a study of the whole body of Beauharnois's despatches leaves the impression of a man enthusiastically in sympathy with La Vérendrye's primary purpose of western discovery, or with what I conceive to have been his primary purpose of western discovery.

It is curious, after a man has assumed a certain hypothesis, how neatly all the available facts can be made to fit into it. Professor Morton's hypothesis is that La Vérendrye's primary purpose was to command the western posts. With that as his touchstone, when he comes to deal with the explorer's decision to winter at Kaministiquia in 1731, he quite naturally comes to this conclusion: "Had his sole, or even his foremost, aim been exploration, he would have, like La Salle or Sir Alexander Mackenzie, pressed on at once as far as might be to his goal." But what puzzles one is that elsewhere Professor Morton has himself told us why La Vérendrye did not press on. His men had mutinied, and "he had to be content with sending La Jemeraye forward," while "he

himself was forced to winter at Kaministiquia." And as to the years that followed, I think a careful reading of all the documents justifies the conclusion that the delays in western discovery were not the result of deliberate policy, but rather of conditions over which La Vérendrye had no effective control.

All of which I suppose merely goes to prove that two men, studying the same documents from somewhat different angles, can arrive at surprisingly different conclusions.

LAWRENCE J. BURPEE

REVIEWS OF BOOKS

The Rise and Fall of New France. By GEORGE M. WRONG. Two vols. Toronto: The Macmillan Company of Canada. 1928. Pp. 925.

CANADIAN historical scholarship already owes a very deep debt of gratitude to Professor Wrong: first, for having taught many hundreds of students by word of mouth how to view all history with a quick eye, an understanding head, and a sympathetic heart; secondly, for having always taken particular pains to make himself the well-informed historical interpreter between the very different kinds of French- and English-speaking peoples, more especially with regard to whatever concerns them in America; and thirdly, for having tried—and with much genuine success—to show the inner meaning of both sides in his volume on *The Conquest of New France* (in the *Chronicles of America*) and in his more individual work on *The Fall of Canada*. He has also turned his many summers spent at Murray Bay to excellent account in *A Canadian Manor and its Seigneurs*. So one naturally approaches his very much more comprehensive work on *The Rise and Fall of New France* in a most cordial spirit, especially when one finds from his preface that these volumes are to be followed by at least a third on the first momentous years of British rule. For, here again, he has two quite special qualifications. He has carefully studied the Canadian Archives relating to that period, and his volume on Washington (in the *Chronicles of America*) has helped him to see how one vexed question looked to those across the Revolutionary line.

These new volumes are something greater, better, and more lasting than any others he has written. Moreover, they seem very well designed to serve as the first of a series bringing the story down to, perhaps, Confederation. That would need four others on the present scale. But Professor Wrong, we hope, has years enough before him in which to do this work as well as he most certainly can do it. He is very modern in his study of the evidence, going either straight to sources or, more frequently, to works directly based on sources and furnished with all the references and bibliographies required to enable students to appreciate the value of their text. But he has no "modernistic" fads. He is not bizarre, or would-be smart and funny, or artful in selecting only such appealing evidence as would fit a given case of

"psychoed" personality. Nor yet does he invent fine phrases, which may be used as "tags"; or try to boil all complex problems down to something of the "tabloid" kind. His method simply is to marshal the important evidence on both sides in such a way that we can see how all the threads were woven together into a living whole.

A few points may be questioned. Is he not going rather far afield in his first five chapters, which deal with Marco Polo, Norse and Spanish pioneers, the French and English earliest claims in North America, and the English on the Pacific Coast? However, it is better to be over-comprehensive than not comprehensive enough. The subsequent arrangement of chapters is very good all through both volumes. The Church, its heroic missionaries, and its connections with the State are well described. But here and elsewhere, Professor Wrong might perhaps have stooped to conquer some of his less well-informed readers by a few simple explanations. The seigneurs as colonizing agents is a case in point. But again, the author may be right in expecting his readers to think it out for themselves. At the end of chapter XVII, p. 416, a few statistics on the wonderful fecundity of the French Canadians would have been appropriate. The expeditions of Phips and Walker against Quebec are adequately treated. The political, naval, military, and other interests are well combined. There are a few slips in naval and military matters. But these are trifles compared with the full and impartial descriptions of the contest at large. British errors and wrongs are never hidden or condoned. Nor, quite rightly, are those of the French. The springs of action are shown at work on both sides, which makes the reader understand why things were what they were. The Acadian question—always a very sorely vexed one—is well treated; and Professor Wrong rightly points out (pp. 772-3) that the actual expulsion was the local work of Lawrence, who had the unanimous approval of all the Thirteen Colonies, but who had no warrant from the Home government. Indeed, the Imperial government's orders against expulsion were on their way while Lawrence was expelling the first draft of Acadians. On receipt of these contrary orders he hurried off the rest, hoping that the unanimous approval of all the American colonists and the outbreak of a world war would combine to change his official standing from that of a disobedient bully to that of a patriotic prophet.

In the final war, perhaps Professor Wrong's work would have gained in its clearness for civilians if he had shown exactly how the French forces were five parts and no whole, and how Montcalm won three campaigns against an overwhelming enemy by the consummate use of interior lines, combined with perfect tactics and most inspiring command. The facts are there. But the description is rather implicit than

explicit, at least so far as the civilian reader is concerned. Opinions will always differ about Wolfe's final plan, which no practical strategist has ever approved, but which he certainly carried out to perfection, thanks greatly to the fleet. But Professor Wrong may well have thought discussion beside the mark. He omits to mention what the naval brigade did on September 13 by hauling up siege material before dark; though he does mention what it did on the seventeenth. His bibliography (p. 891) omits the interesting monograph on *Montcalm au Combat de Carillon*, published by the Historical Section of the French General Staff not long before the recent World War. Sea-power, both mercantile and naval, was of immense importance; and the most striking manifestations described in the narrative might have been grouped together in a few telling paragraphs. It might also have been impressed upon the reader that, in this oversea possession, in which all major transport went by inland waterways, the old calculation of the difference between land and water transport was a decided under-statement. If in the nineteenth century it was easier to move a hundred tons by water than ten by rail or one by road, what must the difference have been during the railless, and practically roadless, New France of the eighteenth century? Moreover, all decisive forces had to come from Europe, and were therefore doubly dependent on sea-power.

A word must be said about the index, an index which the author cannot possibly have seen before the book was published. As a mere nominal index it is good enough. But a history like this cries aloud for a proper subject index; and no attempt whatever has been made to guide inquirers through either the most important tributaries or even the great main stream of such a complex subject. Imagine a guide to New France who utterly ignores any reference to *seigneurs, censitaires, coureurs-de-bois*, or even *habitants*; who gives fifty references to the "French" without defining one; who quite omits the French Canadians, although their differences from the French were of prime importance; and who never mentions any of the various forces engaged in the decisive war—the French regulars *de la terre*, Canadian regulars *de la marine*, militia, combatant Indians, seamen, or even the overwhelming influence of sea-power! All these subjects are duly treated by the author in a very well written text to which the indexer gives the searcher no proper clue whatever.

But, take them for all in all, Professor Wrong's two volumes are not only excellent in themselves, but even better if understood as the first of a series—series which, if continued on such lines will be practically certain to achieve a permanent success.

WILLIAM WOOD

Essai sur la mentalité canadienne-française. By GEORGES VATTIER.

Paris: Champion, 1928. Pp. 384.

Esquisse historique de la colonisation de la province de Québec. By

GEORGES VATTIER. Paris: Champion, 1928. Pp. viii, 128.

MONSIEUR VATTIER, who was at one time a teacher in the Royal Military College at Kingston, attempts an interesting task in his *Essai sur la mentalité canadienne-française*. He endeavours to explain why French Canada remains a remarkably homogeneous and cultural unit in the modern Dominion, retaining its identity in the face of the dominant forces of North America. The task necessarily brings him into history: Book I of his essay is devoted to an account of the historical and geographical forces that have helped to give French Canada a mentality different from that of its European motherland, and markedly different from that of the rest of Canada; Book II describes the characteristics of that mentality.

Monsieur Vattier's book is scholarly. He uses with discrimination the learned monographs of French-Canadian historians, and while he attains no power of style his exposition is clear, and his organization of material logical. His work compares more than favourably with *The Evolution of French Canada* by Jean Bracq, published in 1924. He covers less ground than Dr. Bracq, but uses his authorities with more discrimination. The one criticism is that Monsieur Vattier's general remarks seem obvious to the reader acquainted with the principal works on French-Canadian history, and it is the defect that one might expect in such a work. Only a man endowed with the imaginative insight of Tocqueville or Taine can write with brilliant illumination upon the mentality of a people. However, the book is useful to those who do not read French-Canadian historians, and who seek in brief compass an explanation of the factors that have helped to fashion French Canada.

In his *Esquisse historique de la colonisation de la province de Québec* (1608-1925), Monsieur Vattier surveys briefly the colonizing activities of the French from the foundation of Quebec to the present day. His little book is valuable, for while there are some admirable monographs on aspects of the subject, like Caron's *La colonisation du Canada sous la domination française*, there is no general survey bringing the story of settlement down to the present. This book does not represent independent research in original sources, but is based on careful reading of the many monographs of the French-Canadian historians. The authorities are quoted in footnotes, and there is a bibliography at the end of the volume.

ALEXANDER BRADY

Fray Juan Crespi: Missionary Explorer on the Pacific Coast, 1769-1774.
By HERBERT EUGENE BOLTON. University of California, Berkeley.
1927. Pp. 402.

CRESPI took part in three expeditions: Portola's, 1769-1770; Fages's, 1772; Perez's, 1774. His diaries of these three voyages, which form the main portion of this book, are prime sources for their incidents. The first two diaries deal with the occupation of San Diego, Monterey, and San Francisco. The last, which is of especial interest to the student of Canadian history, gives an account of the first voyage to the coast of British Columbia—that of Juan Perez in 1774. It covers pages 307-366.

Spurred by Russian activities in the north, Spain resolved to strengthen her position and her claim of sovereignty by entering into occupation of the northwest coast. After the foundation of the missions of California, she turned her attention to the distant and forbidding North. In 1774, as a preliminary to actual settlement, Juan Perez was sent in the *Santiago* to take possession at about 60° north latitude. Crespi, a Franciscan friar, and his companion, Peña, were ordered to accompany the expedition in the double capacity of chaplains and diarists. This voyage preceded that of Captain Cook by nearly four years. Though they saw part of Queen Charlotte Islands and of Vancouver Island, the Spaniards did not land at any point. They met the Indians and traded a little with them. Unfortunately the diaries of these Franciscans were not published, even in the original, until about eighty years after the voyage. In 1891 the Historical Society of Southern California issued them, both in English and Spanish.

The present translation differs in many respects from that of the Historical Society; but the differences are chiefly in unimportant details. For example, on July 20, 1774, the society's version runs:

A sailor obtained in exchange for a ribbon he gave them a hat of rushes, well plaited and parti-colored.

The present translation of the same incident says:

A sailor obtained for a large knife that he gave them a well plaited rush hat of several colors.

Professor Bolton has added a short, but comprehensive sketch of Crespi's activities, an appreciation of his work and his character, a memorandum upon the diaries themselves, and a large number of critical notes. Eleven illustrations are inserted in the volume; but, so far as the British Columbian coast is concerned, these are merely reproductions from Dixon's *Voyage*. A real aid has been given to the student by the inclusion of the chart, upon which is delineated the course of the *Santiago* from day to day. The book is beautifully printed from type of large size; and it has an index.

F. W. HOWAY

Sir Martin Frobisher. By WILLIAM MCFEE. (The Golden Hind Series). London: John Lane. 1928. Pp. 288; maps and illustrations. (12s. 6d.).

EACH succeeding volume of the Golden Hind Series adds to its reputation, as equally admirable in conception and execution. No better man could have been found than Mr. William McFee to write the life of that valiant Elizabethan sea-captain, Martin Frobisher. Out of the meagre particulars at his command, he has built up a story in which Frobisher and his contemporaries, from the amazing and incalculable Elizabeth to the humble seaman, live not as men and women of to-day but as men and women of the sixteenth century.

Frobisher has been, to all but a comparatively small group of special students, a very dim figure. He has "been lost to us in the multitude of Elizabethan captains who founded British maritime supremacy." With the exception of a very dull and cumbersome attempt of some fifty years ago, this is the first life of a man who is justly described by Mr. McFee as "one of the greatest of the Elizabethan seamen," and it is a life that will be found equally attractive to those who know something about Frobisher and his achievements, and to those who know nothing. It is, as a biography, adequate, just, and understandable; and, as a book, although written in a style modelled to some extent upon that of Conrad, it nevertheless has a virtue that is all its own.

From the point of view of Canadian history, the important part of Mr. McFee's book is contained in the first nine chapters. In these we find the preparation of Frobisher for his great adventure, the search for the North West Passage, and his three voyages, in 1576, 1577, and 1578, to what has since come to be known as Frobisher Bay, in Baffin Island, north of Hudson Strait. It is the irony of circumstance that Frobisher actually sailed some distance up Hudson Strait in 1578, and, had he not been hopelessly hampered by the cupidity of those who had financed the expedition, and who had put upon him the task of bringing back ship-loads of rock that they were convinced contained gold but that actually contained nothing more valuable than iron pyrites, he would almost certainly have sailed through the Strait and discovered Hudson Bay thirty-two years before Hudson.

Frobisher himself was essentially a man of action, and we have to depend for the account of his voyages upon his lieutenant, George Best, of whose narrative Mr. McFee makes effective use. In the third voyage the fleet was beset by the ice in Hudson Strait, and for a time the little ships were in extreme peril. Here is a fragment of Best's story of the incident:

And albeit, by reason of the fleeting ice, which were dispersed here almost the whole sea over, they were brought many times to the extremest point of peril,

mountains of ice ten thousand times scaping them scarce one inch, which to have stricken had been their present destruction, considering the swift course and way of the ships, and the unwieldiness of them to stay and turn as a man would wish; yet them esteemed it their better safety, with such peril, to seek sea-room, than, without hope of ever getting liberty, to lie striving against the stream, and beating amongst the icy mountains; whose hugeness and monstrous greatness was such that no man could credit but such as, to their pains, saw and felt it.

Frobisher and his captains finally managed to win free of the ice, and bring the fleet into comparatively sheltered waters. Here, says Best, they "welcomed each other after the sea manner with their great ordnance, and when each party had ripped up their sundry fortunes and perils past, they highly praised God, and altogether upon their knees gave Him due humble and hearty thanks." The ships were brought safely back to England, with their tons of worthless rock, and when that worthlessness had been demonstrated, Frobisher, who had had nothing whatever to do with the gold-mine story, was made the scapegoat. Thenceforth he is done with the "dour and invincible seas of the north," and it is not necessary here to follow him to Ireland, where he campaigned with Edmund Spenser and Walter Raleigh; or to the Spanish Main, where he and Francis Drake and other valiant English captains harried the Spaniard; or, again, to that notable year 1588, in which he took no unimportant part in the smashing of the invincible Armada.

One may commend, in conclusion, the carefully-selected illustrations, and particularly the frontispiece—the Bodleian portrait of Frobisher, in breastplate, starched ruff, and sword, holding in his left hand a most fascinating pistol, a sort of miniature blunderbuss.

LAWRENCE J. BURPEE

The Voyage of Captain Thomas James for the Discovery of the North-West Passage. 1631. By Commander R. B. BODILLY, R.N. London and Toronto: J. M. Dent and Sons Ltd. 1928. Pp. 216; map.

IN this book Commander Bodilly tells us the story of this pioneer journey to the south end of Hudson Bay by quoting extracts from Captain James's book and linking these into a continued story with statements and explanations of his own. The book was originally published in 1633 as a small quarto volume, with a map, and is one of the rarest books among collections of Americana. In 1740 a "second edition, revised and corrected" was published, a small octavo volume, with map. There were also other editions published, either in whole or in part. Finally, in 1894, the Hakluyt Society published a copy of the original with introduction and copious notes by Miller Christy. The present volume will prove welcome to those readers who like to read history in a "popular" form.

On May 2, 1631, this adventurous captain, with a crew of twenty-two men, none of whom had had any experience in Arctic waters, sailed from Bristol, in their little seventy-ton ship; and their privations, their winter on the bleak shores of James Bay, passed in a totally inadequate shelter, their ignorance of how to make a log-house, their sufferings from scurvy, and their final return to their homes make a narrative that should appeal to anyone who likes stories of adventure; although, as a recital of the many difficulties encountered, it has been called "The Book of Lamentations." On both the journey out and homeward, James was unfortunate in encountering ice in the southern portion of the Bay. The northern ice is brought southward by the set of the current, down the west side of the Bay and strikes the south shore, where it forms an ice field which occasionally remains all summer. James was there in two of the summers when this happened. In spite of the complaints of great hardships, he was more fortunate than many others, such as Button or Munk, who wintered in the Bay, in that he lost only three men from scurvy during the winter on Charlton Island. He was also fortunate in being forced to winter on this island rather than at some other, more inclement, place, as it is said to be the best spot in James Bay for the purpose, with its protected anchorage and the spring of good water that runs winter and summer.

One curious point in the account is that nowhere does James mention the name of his ship. This is cleared up, however, by a footnote in the Hakluyt Society's edition, where we are told that it was called the *Henrietta Maria* in honour of the queen. This is further borne out by the following quotation from James:

Here wee found the laund trend South South-East and South, so that wee knew we were at a *Cape Land*, and named it *Cape Henrietta Maria*, by her Maiesties name, who had before named our Ship.

Commander Bodilly is able to throw a good deal of light on some of the passages, through his knowledge of navigation, but is greatly hampered by his lack of knowledge of Hudson Bay.

T. A. C. TYRRELL

Valiant La Vérendrye. By IRENE MOORE. Quebec: King's Printer. 1927. Pp. 382.

THIS neat little volume was one of the prize winners in the historical essay competition of the government of Quebec. One would be more heartily in sympathy with such competitions if there was any evidence that they were designed to encourage, or had the effect of encouraging, original research. With every desire to do justice to the present book, it is impossible to say that it adds anything to what was already

known as to the lives and achievements of Pierre Gaultier de la Vérendrye and his sons. At the same time, as it is free from any very important errors, and written in a fairly readable style, it will probably serve very well the purpose for which it seems to be designed—the enlightenment of the school children of modern Quebec as to the exploits of one of the most noteworthy of the sons of Old Quebec. The present edition is in English, but one presumes that the book is also available in French. One rather curious reversion of the usual practice is the placing of a bibliographical note at the beginning of the book, and the table of contents at the end. Also one notes a good many small typographical errors.

L. J. BURPEE

Documents of the Canadian War of 1812. Edited with an Introduction by WILLIAM WOOD. Volume III, Part II. Toronto: The Champlain Society. 1928. Pp. 541-1062.

THIS book, modestly described as Part II of Volume III, is in fact nearly equal in size to any of the preceding volumes. It consists of fifteen appendices and a general index to the entire compilation, as well as to the introduction. The first appendix is a reprint of a rather rare pamphlet entitled "Journal of Events principally on the Detroit and Niagara Frontiers, during the War of 1812, by Capt. W. H. Merritt of the Prov. Light Dragoons." The title has been slightly altered, and the original text of eighty-two pages fill 106 pages in its present form. The wisdom of reprinting it without competent annotation may well be questioned. It contains many errors and inaccuracies, and has few of the merits of a contemporary narrative, as the original manuscript was radically altered for publication, both by interpolations and omissions, many years after the events described, and probably after the death of the writer.

The next appendix, entitled "Canadian Regulars," contains thirty-four documents, hitherto apparently unpublished, relating mainly to the organization and administration of the Canadian Fencibles, Canadian Voltigeurs, and the Glengarry Light Infantry, enlisted for general service during the war. Another collection of fourteen "miscellaneous documents" deals in a similarly effective manner mainly with the "embodied militia" of Lower Canada. Six other documents are concerned with the two "Independent companies of Foreigners," or Chasseurs Britanniques, whose record was far from creditable. The value of the appendix entitled "Indians," may be best estimated by a comparison with the larger collection of documents from the same source printed in volumes XV and XVI of the publications of the Michigan Historical Society, more than thirty years ago and since republished.

Other appendices on "Pay and Allowances," "Prize Money," "Fuel, Food, Fatigues and Clothing," "Dress and Ceremonies," "Women and Children," "Honours," "Pension," and "Land Grants" complement the information already published on those subjects in Mr. L. H. Irving's useful book.

Thirty-five documents relating to prisoners of war are mostly concerned with cartels, exchanges, transport, complaints of ill usage, threats of retaliation, and similar disagreeable subjects.

In the section entitled "Secret Service," several interesting references are made to the activities of Joel Ackley, at one time a land surveyor and for many years a resident in Lower Canada, who, when domiciled during the war at Plattsburg in the state of New York, had transmitted useful military intelligence to British officers, and was arrested and imprisoned for several months as a spy. After his release he acted as a guide to the advanced guard of a column in the movement against that place. He was subsequently awarded five hundred pounds as a gratuity. It is somewhat surprising that his petition, dated at Montreal, November 22, 1814, giving a circumstantial account of his services, imprisonment, and losses, has been overlooked or purposely omitted. No mention is made of Marvin Hunter and Samuel Casey, two capable "secret agents," who operated from Kingston in the region of Sackett's Harbour.

The preparation of the index, filling two hundred closely printed pages, with the entries arranged in two parallel columns, has been a most laborious task and has been particularly well done. It is remarkably full and accurate. The title "Indians" fills nine columns; fifteen are given to "orders"; "regiments" occupy eleven. Brock has six columns, Drummond an equal number; Prevost, Procter, and Yeo have four each. Short biographical notes are included on Brock, Brown, Dearborn, Drummond, FitzGibbon, Hull, Prevost, Procter, Riall, Rottenburg, Salaberry, Tecumseth, Vincent, and Yeo. Great care has been taken to ascertain and give the full Christian names of nearly all the British officers mentioned; American officers have not received like attention. If the index is not quite perfect, errors are few and unimportant. The value of such an index to these volumes cannot be overstated. The addition of a table of corrigenda and errata would have been useful.

E. A. CRUIKSHANK

When Fur was King. By HENRY JOHN MOBERLY in collaboration with WILLIAM BLEASDELL CAMERON. With illustrations by JOHN INNES and from photographs. London and Toronto: J. M. Dent and Sons. 1929. Pp. xvii, 237.

THIS volume is chiefly an account of the experiences of a pioneer in the

North-west from 1854 to 1894, and apparently written at a much later date. Mr. W. Bleasdel Cameron has added a biographical note and apparently an appendix. It is stated that Mr. H. J. Moberly was born at Penetanguishene, Ontario, in 1835, was educated at Barrie and Upper Canada College, spent two years in St. Petersburg with Lloyds and joined the Hudson's Bay Company in 1854, with a five year contract dated June 1, 1853. With a couple of short intermissions, he was in the employ of the Company until 1894, and during these forty years he was engaged in various activities connected with the fur-trade throughout the North-west, but chiefly in the vicinity of Edmonton. The account here given is misleading at various points, as a result, no doubt, of a failing memory, but from other sources the particulars of his career can be checked. From a copy of the *Journal of Fort Edmonton* 1854-5 and 1855-6 in the University of Toronto library, we learn, for example, that Mr. Moberly visited that post from Rocky Mountain House after a hard trip on March 16, 1855, whereas his account claims that he arrived there for Christmas. His account states that the outfits from Lesser Slave Lake and Jasper House arrived on May 8, 1855, but the journal shows no such arrivals. In the New Year's celebration 1856 he states that the blacksmith was killed, but the journal contradicts this. In 1857 he notes that the Earl of Southesk was on the Saskatchewan, but this should be 1859. The Earl of Southesk refers to his meeting with Moberly near Lake St. Anne on August 19, 1859, on the latter's return from Jasper House, a very different account from Moberly's (p. 91). The account, therefore, cannot be trusted at all points. It is suggested that the following dates should be changed 1858-9 to 1857-8 (p. 98), 1859-60 to 1858-9 (p. 107), and 1860-1 to 1859-60 (p. 109). Other errors which should be noted are the following: the Hudson's Bay Company has never operated a screw steamer on the Mackenzie River (pp. 133, 151); the screw steamer operated on the Mackenzie by the Northern Trading Company was wrecked in 1924. Peace Point is 178 miles below Fort Vermilion (p. 134).

Apart from the errors noted, the volume is of very great value in its descriptions of the fur trade in the latter days of the Hudson's Bay Company's monopoly and the early period of competition. It will take its place along with Isaac Cowie, *The Company of Adventurers*, and N. M. W. J. Mackenzie, *Men of the Hudson's Bay Company*. Historians will be grateful for the material made available on the customs of the trade, and especially for a definite statement that the Hudson's Bay Company discouraged any attempts to develop settlement in Western Canada by sending individuals vociferous on the possibilities of the country to more distant posts. The sketches are interesting but the map is unsatisfactory.

H. A. INNIS

Select Documents on British Colonial Policy, 1880-1860. Edited by KENNETH N. BELL and W. P. MORRELL. Toronto: Oxford University Press. 1928. Pp. xlix, 610. (\$7.50.)

THE documents, and parts of documents, in this selection are drawn, as the dates show, from the period in which were laid the foundations of the present-day Empire. They are classified in six sections: self-government, colonization, transportation, commercial policy, slavery and the plantation system, native and frontier policy. The range is wide; the choice is made, on the whole, with judgment; and the student of Imperial development will find his appetite whetted for more. The basis for investigation is so extended that a more liberal selection would have been impracticable in a single volume. This limitation, however, both as to content and period, does not prevent the work being a useful survey of the whole field, since the material bears, directly and indirectly, upon problems which are now up, either for consideration or for legislation, in either Great Britain or the Overseas Dominions. In dealing with Canada the editors announce that the documents in Professor Kennedy's *Documents of the Canadian Constitution* have been omitted of set purpose. The Canadian student, therefore, must have recourse to that author's works and to the collection of Egerton and Grant. As commercial policy is much to the fore at present, and is likely to be for years, it might be thought that more documents under this head would have been advisable. But the editors, not unwisely, have kept in view the subject of colonial policy as a whole, rightly assuming that solid research does not confine itself to the narrow area of one part of the Empire only, nor to one phase of a very broad subject. The present selection, in point of fact, proves that he who sets out to master the entire problem has a long road before him. There is a full and agreeably written introduction on men and measures associated with the period, intimate sketches of the Colonial Office worthies, and of statesmen like Glenelg, Earl Grey, Elgin, and Sir George Grey, and a developed point of view essentially English, but not on that account failing to recognize the attitude, just or unjust, of the opinions that were struggling to assert themselves beyond the seas. In places, and they are few, where the Briton abroad would modify the conclusions reached, the effect is to stimulate the enquirer to additional research which is a useful purpose in a book of this kind.

A. H. U. COLQUHOUN

The Origins of the World War. By SIDNEY BRADSHAW FAY. Two Volumes. Toronto: The Macmillans in Canada. 1928. Pp. xvii, 551; xi, 577; illustrations.

It is natural that upon the question of war origins there should be fierce

and interminable controversy. Between statesmen and diplomats excusing themselves and accusing others, patriotic historians vindicating their countries of "war guilt," and disillusioned radicals rushing in to accuse their pre-war leaders, the waters of truth have been sadly muddled. However, the "bitter-enders," "salvagers," and "revisionists," as one American historian neatly dubbed them, have all agreed in saluting the pioneer work of Professor Fay of Smith College who published during 1920 in the *American Historical Review* the first objective articles on the subject. Ever since, Professor Fay has serenely gone on his way collecting his materials and publishing occasional important articles and reviews. At one moment the "revisionists" would claim him as theirs because of his clash with Mr. Seton-Watson over Serb responsibility for the murder of the Austrian archduke, while at another they would be confounded by his praise of M. Renouvin for having written "the best comprehensive treatment in any language" upon the immediate origins of the war.

Professor Fay has at last published his own findings in the two stout volumes under review. Once again he has puzzled some of his fellow-workers by defying classification. It is amusing to note how a "revisionist" hails the book as proclaiming "the twilight of the myth-mongers," while a "salvager" takes a malicious delight in pointing out the number of times the author has differed with the extreme left. This simply means that Professor Fay has done what might have been expected of him. He has given us the most authoritative and impartial survey of war origins that has appeared to date. It is not the final judgment, as the author would be the first to admit, in view of the gaps in the evidence. Several times in his book he warns his readers that, for the time being, judgment must be suspended until the remaining British documents and the French series are available. Even in the short time since publication, we have had new light upon the position of the British cabinet in 1914 through the publication of Lord Morley's *Memorandum*, while the autobiography of Lord Haldane, appearing at present in serial form, has given us a few more details about the Anglo-French conversations of 1906.

The author devotes the first volume to European diplomacy between 1870 and 1914, and the second to the events from the Sarajevo murder to the descent into the abyss of the World War. They are not easy reading for a novice, and have not the *saeva indignatio* of the volume by Mr. Lowes Dickinson or the undercurrent of restrained feeling in Herr Brandenburg's monograph to hold the reader's attention, but they amply repay close study. In Volume I we have an indispensable analysis of the pre-war policies of the great powers which easily supersedes any

previous account. It is fascinating to watch the author dissect problem after problem patiently and thoroughly, quietly correcting when necessary the errors of previous scholars. We are given valuable sketches of such statesmen as Bülow, Bethmann-Hollweg, Poincaré, and Sazonov, and a masterly analysis of the Balkan problems, which, he admits, were "most nearly incapable of a peaceful solution."

The second volume does not break so much new ground, but is marked by the same minute analysis of vexed issues. The exhaustive treatment of the Sarajevo murder plot is especially valuable, though the reviewer regrets the omission, probably through lack of data, of any discussion of the connection which some writers charge Artmanov, the Russian military attaché at Belgrade, had with the Black Hand. Professor Fay throws a damaging light upon the activities of Paléologue in St. Petersburg, which should draw from that diplomat an explanation—if he has one to offer. In his final summing up, he decisively rejects the war responsibility article in the Versailles treaty, but declines to apportion the responsibility mathematically. His severest strictures are reserved for Berchtold and the Austrian government, though the German and Russian governments also receive sharp criticism.

FREDERIC H. SOWARD

The Conduct of British Empire Foreign Relations since the Peace Settlement.

By ARNOLD J. TOYNBEE. (Issued under the auspices of the Royal Institute of International Affairs). Toronto: Oxford University Press. 1928. Pp. xii, 126.

The Four Dominions. By TREVOR SMITH. London: Selwyn and Blount. 1927. Pp. 76.

Pax Britannica. By B. G. DE MONTGOMERY. London: Methuen & Co. 1928. Pp. x, 249.

OF these three books only the first is worth the attention of serious students. The other two may be presumed to be pot-boilers. In his chapter on Canada in *The Four Dominions*, the author tells us that Mr. King held up Lord Byng's action "as an example of the old bogey of Downing St. domination," that he was in a very anti-imperial mood in 1923, and that, even after the Conference of 1926, his friendliness to the Empire is somewhat uncertain. Such misrepresentations as these would be grotesque if they appeared in any book that was not so obviously journalistic.

Pax Britannica is "a study of the international relations of the British Empire with special regard to its functions as a guardian of peace and security in the world." One would judge that a good deal of it must have been written for magazine articles about 1926. The

author writes like Macaulay's schoolboy. He has the same superficial omniscience and the same facility in reaching the respectable conclusions about everything. He wants a series of imperial industrial combines of the vertical trust type; he is sure that it is best for India to establish only such industries as are "economically justified, *i.e.*, industries which can develop under inter-imperial free trade"; he thinks the best future for Russia is to be administered and policed by British and Scandinavian officials; he hopes that "the nations of Europe will trust themselves to the advice of British statesmen as they did at Lausanne and Locarno, . . . for they will then be guided along the same paths . . . which led the British Empire to peace and security, prosperity and greatness." He should have called his book "Rule Britannia."

Mr. Toynbee's book is of an entirely different order. It is an authoritative study of the methods by which the foreign affairs of the Empire have been conducted since 1919. It displays the same enormous range of exact knowledge, the same impartiality, and the same easy charming style which we have learned to expect from the author of the *Survey of International Affairs*. The book is written in the form, not of a chronological history, but of a series of analytical notes. It rather gives the impression of a succession of developments flowing on as smoothly and as placidly as the Isis at Oxford; whereas everyone who has followed imperial history since the War knows that most of these developments, such as Lausanne and the Halibut treaty, gave rise to a sharp conflict of opinion and clash of wills. One inevitably compares Mr. Toynbee's discussion with the chapters in Professor Keith's *Responsible Government* which deal with the same topics; and one cannot help feeling that the incisive and unsparing comments on men and events which mark the last edition of that work not only make good reading, but give the reader a more realistic picture of the processes by which the British Empire has reached its present condition. But perhaps if the statesmen of the British nations read and ponder upon Mr. Toynbee's *Surveys*, they will become as urbane in their dealings with one another as he is in discussing those dealings.

FRANK H. UNDERHILL

History of the Americas: A Syllabus with Maps. By HERBERT EUGENE BOLTON. Boston: Ginn and Company. 1928. Pp. xxii, 314.

THIS syllabus represents a departure from the ordinary courses on American history offered in the universities of the United States and Canada. Professor Bolton in it traces the development of the twin continents of America from Cape Horn to the North Pole. The key-note of the volume is struck in the following sentences from the preface:

The time has come for a broader course in American history, to supplement the type of course in national history traditionally given. European history cannot be learned from books dealing alone with England or France or Germany, nor can American history be adequately taught if confined to the United States or Brazil or Canada or Mexico. Most present-day political boundary lines in America are of recent origin; culture and commerce quite naturally ignore them.

The syllabus has been most carefully constructed to portray the development of European civilization in North and South America. It is based on very wide reading, sound research, and a teaching experience of many years duration. The maps, which are especially fine, provide in themselves a valuable historical atlas of the Americas.

Dr. Bolton has tried to show the place of Canadian history in the general development of the twin continents. He claims that "the revolt of thirteen of the British Colonies laid the foundations not of one but of two English-speaking nations in North America," and he traces the rise of the two provinces of Old Canada, of the provinces down by the sea, and of the great fur-trading empire of the West. He sketches the growth of the Dominion since 1867 and gives credit to Canadians for their part in the World War. The lists of reference books on Canadian history show that he is well versed in the writings of Canadian historians.

In a word, this syllabus of the history of the Americas strikes a new note in historical study, comparable only with that sounded more than a generation ago by Professor Frederick Jackson Turner when he published his celebrated essay on *The Significance of the Frontier in American History*.

W. N. SAGE

The New World Problems in Political Geography. By ISAIAH BOWMAN. Fourth edition. Yonkers-on-Hudson and Chicago: World Book Company. 1928. Pp. v, 803; maps.

Geography of North America. By GEORGE J. MILLER and ALMON E. PARKINS. New York: John Wiley and Sons. 1928. Pp. xv, 605.

Géographie humaine de Montréal. By RAYMOND TANGHE. Montreal: Librairie d'Action canadienne-française. 1928. Pp. 334.

THE various editions of the volume by Dr. Bowman have become generally recognized as handbooks which, brought down to date with each new edition, no student of world politics can afford to neglect. For each nation a survey is given of population problems in relation to races and density, economic resources and activities (industry, trade, and public finance), political organization, and boundary disputes with special reference to post-war points of friction, adjustments, and agreements. In the discussion relating to Canada, minor points may be criticized but they are chiefly regarding the overemphasis or under-

emphasis of certain factors. For example, the present reviewer would hold, contrary to Dr. Bowman, that sectionalism has never been as important in Canada as in the United States (p. 71). The whole is clearly written, abundantly illustrated with maps, and has a select, but in some ways inadequate, bibliography and a valuable index.

The second volume under review is "intended for use as a basal text and not as a treatise," and emphasis is placed on the methods of teaching geography. The subject is divided politically and regionally with special reference to the physiography, climate, agriculture, industry, and other economic characteristics of each region or of sections of each region. The defects of the volume appear in a glaring fashion in the discussion of Canada (pp. 434-524). The book is a vast compendium of facts arranged in catalogue order, and errors are numerous. Churchill and not Nelson is the Hudson Bay outlet (p. 434). The myth that wheat is matured north of the Arctic circle is perpetuated (p. 434). Among other errors the following may be cited: the nickel and silver fields of Cobalt and Sudbury produce 90 per cent. of the value of minerals of the Canadian shield (p. 440); silver is sent from Cobalt to Ontario (p. 494); paper is not made in New Brunswick and Nova Scotia (p. 463); Fort Vancouver was in British Columbia (p. 519). The caption on one photograph (p. 499) is wrong, and some of the other photographs are poorly chosen. One could scarcely expect a valid analysis of the numerous facts presented. We cannot agree that Canada is economically and socially a northern extension of the United States (p. 436). Her lines of growth have been fundamentally different. Manufacturing increased much more rapidly than in the United States, especially after 1900, not more slowly. Canada has always produced for an international market, and not only since 1867 (p. 466). The bibliography is weak. It is with concern that one reads (p. vi) that Mr. F. C. C. Lynch, director of the Natural Resources Intelligence Branch, read the entire manuscript on Canada, but no one individual can be held responsible for the lack of development of geography in Canada.

If the geographers of the United States are handicapped by the backward state of geography in Canada, it is with satisfaction that one turns to the volume by Mr. Tanghe for its own value and its promise. The book is obviously one of the indirect results of the visit of M. Jean Brunhes to Canada and the influence of the latter's point of view is evident at every turn. Indeed, in the discussion of certain intangible factors such as language, Mr. Tanghe out-Brunhes Brunhes. The author discusses in turn the geographic position of Montreal and its situation with reference to such points as natural routes (the ocean, the Great Lakes,

the Ottawa and the Richelieu-Hudson); the demands of the metropolis as to its food supply, building materials, fuel and water power; the human factor in relation to the natural routes, and to what are called human routes, roads, streets, vehicles, parks, bridges, railways, telephone, wireless telegraphy, and aviation. The importance of these factors is shown in the description of the evolution of the house and the general architecture of Montreal. There follows logically a discussion of problems of population density, distribution of races and factors of trade and industry responsible for the general alignment of population. Finally, there is an analysis of the problems of hygiene, finance, and government, in which the author urges the appointment of a metropolitan commission to give intelligent direction to the general lines of growth of the city. The general breadth and scope of the work, showing the relation of geography to all factors in the metropolitan growth of the city of Montreal, shows geography at its best. The volume is commended to all writers on the geography of North America as the most promising work in the subject which has yet appeared in Canada. It has the broad suggestiveness which characterizes Brunhes and the French school generally.

There are certain defects, the most serious of which is shown in the weakness of the knowledge of historical background. There is no mention of Miss Newbiggin's work. The volume is not improved by arguments in favour of the Georgian Bay Ship Canal and against the St. Lawrence waterway. The strong French-Canadian bias mars its scientific value. Details which should be corrected include the fact that the Haileybury district produces silver, not gold (p. 89). Port Nelson should be Churchill (p. 168). One can hardly forgive the mistakes in proof-reading, especially on page 31, and the inconsistent spelling of Brunhes.

H. A. INNIS

The American Indian Frontier. By WILLIAM CHRISTIE MACLEOD. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1928. Pp. xxiv, 598; 13 maps.

THIS book deals with the contacts of Europeans and natives in the two Americas, treating the subject in its broadest aspects. The author's background for his task is varied, but excellent. As an anthropologist, he knows the life, particularly the government, of the Indian tribes; as an economist, he describes the conditions in various European countries during the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, as well as in the newly established settlements; as an historian, he is familiar with recent and contemporary literature pertinent to the subject. His bibliography, containing over 1200 titles, shows the scope of his reading, and explains his ability to draw interesting parallels between the frontier of civiliza-

tion in Virginia and that in Ireland and Scotland, to comment on the spread of Islam, and to delve into Chinese history. His courage is as striking as his erudition. Whereas most historians and anthropologists devote a treatise to proving one or two generalizations, he positively bristles with them. The vexed question of foreign influence in the development of Indian culture is summarized, analysed, explained, and dismissed in a single chapter; and similar treatment is applied to the policy and aims both of governments of, and of private groups in, Spain and Portugal, France, England, the Netherlands, Sweden, and later, the United States. Though specialists may find much to criticize in the author's sweeping conclusions, they are undoubtedly thought-provoking.

Mr. MacLeod rightly regards wars and campaigns as subsidiary to economic and social conditions. Thus the exploits of Pizarro and Cortez receive scant attention in comparison with the attitude of mind of Spaniards and Portuguese to the natives, and with their systems of forced labour. In Latin America the Indians were wards, to be converted and to be civilized, and Spain, like Rome, enforced peace and order; whereas in North America the native kingdoms were treated as sovereign states. To this fundamental difference Mr. MacLeod largely attributes the fact that—in spite of considerable cruelty and maladministration—the Indians in South and Central America have largely survived, whereas north of Mexico they have almost disappeared.

As sovereign states, the Indians were expected to have legal and constitutional practices comparable to those of Europe, whereas in reality their life was that of the stone age, through which the ancestors of the immigrants had passed thousands of years before. At best it would have been difficult for the natives to adjust themselves to a new economic world, but the introduction of alcohol, new diseases, and the constant pressure of increasing settlement gave them no chance to settle down and consolidate their gains. After the friendly intercourse of the first few years, disputes arose, warfare engendered hate,—not the reverse, as is sometimes claimed,—and lack of consistent, tolerant, and forceful policy produced constant wars.

Mr. MacLeod paints the picture remorselessly. The Puritans perhaps fare worst, but he shows how English and Dutch and French all used the Indians as pawns in the quest for wealth or power; nor does he spare the natives, whose greed and selfishness are likewise depicted pitilessly. Legal quibbles over land tenure, encouragement of scalping, massacre of Indian women and children, deliberate use of rum to sap the energies of tribes allied to European rivals, all are dragged to light. The author seemingly revels in the use of contemporary documents to expose the

clay feet of those pioneers who have been popularly, but unscientifically, classed as heroes, and equally to confound the sentimentalists to whom the Indian is the "noble red man."

Mr. MacLeod's treatment of frontier events as incidental to the economic and psychological aspects of contact is excellent. It is the proper method of approach, but it necessitates generalizations; he does not hesitate to make them, but the habit leads him into assertions on points not pertinent to his subject. His reference to "Lincoln's regrettable social blunder in wholesale premature emancipation" (p. 304), and statements that "Bancroft and his followers were actuated by an anti-clerical bias" (p. 339), that a speech of Adams contained "bombast typical of American politicians of presidential calibre" (p. 463), and that Pope Paul III "and his advisers were morally in advance of their age and of centuries to follow" (p. 124) are unnecessary dogmatisms. His pen-pictures are striking, but again the lure of the telling phrase leads him to describe a certain writer as a nephew of "John Milton, the poet who made Satan a hero" (p. 170). Such comments, and there are many of the same type, may lead the reader to question the author's accuracy and judgment in less well-known matters. Nor is the book free from minor errors; the index is poor, misprints in names or dates occur on pages 116, 247, 431, 463; the Great Auk was not a penguin¹ (p. 188); and most of the Neutrals lived in Ontario, not Ohio (p. 282).

Historians will find this book stimulating and interesting; the reviewer hopes that the author's sweeping generalizations, some of which may be questioned, will not blind the specialist to the value of a work which portrays, from both points of view, the frontier between white and Indian.

T. F. McILWRAITH

British Columbia: The Making of a Province. By F. W. HOWAY.
Toronto: The Ryerson Press. 1928. Pp. x, 289.

BRITISH COLUMBIA has a fascinating history, distinct, on the whole, from that of the remainder of Canada. Judge Howay, who has devoted his life to the study of the early days of this province, has, from his full knowledge and long experience, written the first adequate short history of British Columbia suitable to the general reader. In a little less than three hundred pages he has told its story from the "twilight period, before the dawn, in which fact and fiction are intertwined" down to the rise of Vancouver as one of the grain ports of the world.

Four nations strove for possession of the "Far West Coast." In the

¹It was so described by several early writers, but its position, ornithologically, is now well recognized.

end, three obtained portions of it. On at least two occasions, the Nootka Sound controversy and the Oregon boundary dispute, war seemed imminent. During the Crimean War there was no fighting in North America although there was an unsuccessful expedition to Petropaulovsk. The historian is naturally tempted to go into details regarding this struggle of the nations, but Judge Howay has placed severe restrictions upon himself and he tells his story in very few words. Sometimes, especially in his treatment of the Indians of British Columbia, one wishes he had told us more. But space forbade.

Judge Howay has delved deep into the history of the maritime fur-trade and his researches are made evident not in the details of many voyages but in summaries which he gives (*e.g.*, in Chapter XII) and in the general atmosphere of the book. With such a wealth of material at his disposal, the author has succeeded in producing a volume which is a model of condensation. None the less, it is impossible to avoid detail altogether, and in places, especially towards the end of the book, the author has given in the text statistical summaries which provide necessary information but lack the colour and interest of earlier chapters. The concluding chapter bristles with statistics. This, however, is almost inevitable in a book of this length.

One of the charming features of the volume is found in the pen and ink sketches of Mr. John Innes. Mr. Innes has vividly caught the fleeting gleam of historical artistry and has made the scenes live. He is especially good in his portrayal of canoes and horses. He is not so successful in his reproduction of portraits. But his drawings add a certain piquancy to the book. The other illustrations, taken from contemporary sources, are very good. It is to be regretted that the only map in the book—it deals with the San Juan water boundary—has been placed by the binder after the chapter on the Alaska boundary. A general map of British Columbia would have been a welcome addition to the interest of the volume.

The last hundred pages are devoted to the period after Confederation. Here Judge Howay is blazing new trails, or following his own trails of years ago. He has traced the intricacies of the political situation before the adoption of party politics in the provincial field and has shown how unstable the ministries were. Each leader found his own group, and these groups changed like kaleidoscopes until Sir Richard McBride and his Conservatives took office in 1903. But through it all, like the chorus of a Greek tragedy, appears the strife of Mainland *versus* Island. The author shows how the battles over the route and terminal of the Canadian Pacific Railway were due to the rivalry of the two sections of the province. In the end the Fraser Valley route was favoured and the

terminus placed on Burrard Inlet. Mining development is adequately treated but more might have been said of the other industries, and especially of lumbering, fishing, and fruit-growing. But to write the economic history of British Columbia after 1871 would require a volume of no slender proportions.

There are a few misprints and minor errors in the book, but they do not seriously detract from its value. The appendix contains a full list of the governors of Vancouver Island, of British Columbia, and of the United Colony, as well as lists of the lieutenant-governors and premiers of the province of British Columbia. The "list of the principal and readily-accessible printed sources used in the preparation of this history" provides a valuable guide to the chief works which deal with the story of the Pacific Province.

Judge Howay is to be sincerely congratulated on having published a much desired and long awaited volume which all British Columbians will deeply appreciate.

W. N. SAGE

The Colonial Postal Systems and Postage Stamps of Vancouver Island and British Columbia, 1849-1871. By ALFRED STANLEY DEAVILLE. (Archives of British Columbia, Memoir, No. VIII.) Victoria, B.C.: The King's Printer. 1928. Pp. 210.

THE author of this memoir is secretary to the postmaster at Victoria, B.C. He is writing, therefore, of a subject in whose atmosphere he lives. He has sketched the history of the province in sufficient detail to give canvas for his special study. He has used the well-known authorities quite freely, but in some instances without acknowledgment. In the main his historical background is accurate; the errors, with one or two exceptions, are negligible. Those exceptions relate to the union of the two colonies. The island colony was merged in the larger colony. The proper date is November 19, 1866; but our author persists (pp. 106, 129, and 172) in giving the date of the document instead of the date of its promulgation, which, as the very authority cited shows, is the effective one.

When he comes to deal with the postal systems, or lack of system, he is at home, and his work shows the careful student. In this pioneering effort he has had access to the post office papers in the department and to the wealth of materials relating to the early days of the province contained in the provincial archives. These original sources he has carefully worked up and pieced together in a finely arranged and complete study of the pre-confederation postal conditions. The somewhat haphazard postal service—if such it could be called—of the days of Governor Douglas irked his successors on island and mainland. It did

seem anomalous that express companies should carry mail matter in opposition to the mail service. They, however, soon found that this plan fitted reasonably well with the shifting and primitive conditions. A postal service, too, in which the conveyance of the mails was both fortuitous and gratuitous, and in which the postmasters were frequently mere unpaid volunteers was one from which little efficiency could be expected. The various chapters of the book tell all the troubled story of these early postal efforts. The appendices, especially appendix C, throw much light upon, and enter into minute details of, many questions that will interest the philatelists. A perusal of the work completely substantiates the opening statement of the provincial archivist congratulating the author upon "the admirable manner in which he has elucidated the complicated history of the early postal systems in operation in the colonies of Vancouver Island and British Columbia between the years, 1849-1871."

The mechanical work of the book is up to the high standard of the Government Printing Office. The form of marginal notes, adopted in the earliest volumes of the Archives Memoir series, has been revived. The book is illustrated with some fourteen plates, mostly new, and some of which reproduce covers and stamps of the period. The index has been carefully compiled; it seems complete; and it is of real assistance.

F. W. HOWAY

Die Landwirtschaft in den Prärieprovinzen West-Kanadas. Von Dr. A.

GOCKEL. Berlin: Paul Parey. 1928. Pp. 140; maps. (M7.50.)

DR. GOCKEL has broken new ground in Germany. His book is a skilful and scholarly account of farming conditions on the Canadian prairies. Having been there, and being an academically trained agriculturist, he is able to deal with such questions as soil, rotation, plant diseases, etc. His chapter on the pools throws much light on a subject which is arousing interest in Europe. Apparently he wrote before Professor Patton's *Grain Growers' Coöperation in Western Canada* was published, as it is not cited in his well-chosen list of sources, chiefly official. On page 87 he draws attention to the wasteful habits of prairie farmers so noticeable to non-Canadians in connection with neglect to shelter machinery and cars. His remarks certainly hold good in most cases, but he is misleading when, in connection therewith, he quotes the number of illiterates in the West, and omits to state that illiteracy is practically confined to south-east Europeans. Nor does it seem logical to attribute neglect of this sort to lack of education. When he writes (p. 98) that population is the most crying need of Canada, he is by no means a *vox clamantis in deserto*.

There are several typographical and minor errors of fact: e.g., "Lemböden" instead of "Lehmböden" (p. 8); "Timothe" for "Timothy" (p. 14 and elsewhere); "North American Act" instead of "North America Act." The C.P.R. was never a "staatliches Unternehmung" (p. 18). It is doubtful whether a German reader would recognize "Jc." for "Junction" (p. 19). On page 21 Port Nelson should read Churchill. In dealing with harvesting machinery (p. 38) mention should have been made of the combine. "Kalkutta" should read "Calcutta," and "Rede," "Red" (p. 45), "Weath," "Wheat" (p. 46). In quoting the number of mules in Saskatchewan (p. 50), there is no reason why the year 1923 should have been chosen in a book published in 1928. In dealing with ensilage (p. 51) sufficient attention has not been paid to sunflowers. Many important statistics are based on dates no later than 1923, e.g., those appertaining to sheep (p. 52). The statement on page 76 that in "den europäischen Ländern der Weizen leicht durch Roggen und Kartoffeln ersetzt werden kann" will not bear investigation. Those European countries that consumed more rye bread than wheaten before the war now prefer the latter. A remarkable fact about the war, that has hitherto escaped attention, is that it was mainly a war of wheat-eaters against rye-eaters. Canada is not producing 10 per cent. of the world's wheat (p. 76), but at least 14 per cent. And in coming to conclusions in connection with her position as a wheat-producer, the main question is: what is her position as an exporter? Of the world's total export of wheat and wheat flour expressed in bushels amounting to 848,231,000 bushels in 1927-28, Canada exported 287,896,000 bushels (*Monthly Bulletin of Agricultural Statistics*, Oct., 1928, p. 372). In dealing with rural credits (p. 83 *et seq.*), no mention is made of the Canadian Farm Loan Act of 1927. There is nothing to support the statement that Spirit River will be connected by rail with Prince Rupert (p. 91), much as the Peace River country needs a direct outlet to the sea, either at Prince Rupert or further north. But these are small blemishes, and do not detract from the general utility of the book. The same remark does not apply to the lack of an index. There is no excuse for this, except that Continental writers appear to suffer from an inhibition in connection with indexes.

L. HAMILTON

A Bibliography of Alaskan Literature, 1724-1924. By JAMES WICKER-SHAM. Cordova, Alaska: Cordova Daily Times. 1928. Pp. xxvii, 635.

BIBLIOGRAPHIES are always a surprise to the uninitiated; but the present volume listing 10,380 items relating to Alaska will surprise most students

of its history. Included therein are some 3 500 public documents of the United States, besides magazine articles, Alaskan newspapers, and Russian school text-books. No printed speeches, maps, or manuscripts are, with a few outstanding exceptions, included.

The compilation has plainly been a labour of love extending over twenty years and becoming, as the foreword hints, almost an obsession. The author opens his work with a concise and accurate outline of Alaskan history, covering some thirty-seven pages, and serving as a back-ground against which stands the list of books.

The student of the maritime trade will find here a reasonably complete list of the printed material relating to the voyages beginning with Bering, passing down through Cook, La Pérouse, Meares, and Dixon to the end of the Boston pedlars. He will note, as a sidelight on Russian conditions, that the earliest account of Bering's voyage of 1728 appeared in French in 1735. He will find about ninety Cook items and about forty-five on La Pérouse; but he will be startled at the absence of Meares's *Answer to Dixon* and Dixon's *Further Remarks*. Portlock's beautiful quarto volume seems also to have been overlooked.

The literature of that ill-starred venture, the Collins Overland Telegraph scheme, is very fully listed. The introduction tells the story of its effort to connect America and Europe by land wires and a submarine cable across Bering Strait. The bibliography enumerates 142 Alaskan items attributed to W. H. Dall, the director of the scientific corps of the undertaking. The Bering Sea and Alaska Boundary arbitrations, which bulk so large in the story, are well represented, though there appear to be a number of small omissions. Such oversights are to be expected in a compilation of this kind, despite infinite patience and meticulous care. The author assuredly has, as is claimed, "rendered a very notable service, and has provided the casual enquirer as well as the student with a most comprehensive time-saving device."

F. W. HOWAY

Alexander Graham Bell: The Man who Contracted Space. By CATHERINE MACKENZIE. Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin Co. 1928. Pp. xiv, 382; illustrations.

ALTHOUGH the author of this volume disclaims the intention of writing a full-fledged biography, she was able to make use of the extensive records on which such a book might be based. For some eight years before Bell's death she worked with him, much of the time being spent in compiling and arranging the biographical material which Bell indefatigably collected. Numerous quotations are given from letters and contemporary newspapers and magazines, and these are, perhaps, the most valuable feature

of the book. A very full index makes up in part for the omission of chapter headings. The volume is copiously illustrated.

The narrative is a description of Bell's life in terms of his interests and activities, and these were remarkably numerous and varied. The steps by which the telephone was brought to perfection are clearly described. Of special interest to Canadian readers are the accounts of the experiments at Brantford in 1876 and of the relations with George Brown. Brown's failure in 1876 to carry out promises with reference to obtaining patents in England had serious consequences which Bell never forgot. A pardonable note of admiration runs through the book, but the author does not hesitate to admit that there was little practical result from many of Bell's later investigations.

GEORGE W. BROWN

Crowland. By LOUIS BLAKE DUFF. (Baskerville Press Quartos No. V.)

Welland, Canada: Baskerville Press. 1928. Pp. 60; illustrations. This volume deserves notice here for two reasons. In the first place, it is in some sense a local history of the township of Crowland in the Niagara peninsula, though the greater part of it is taken up with an account of Crowland Abbey in England, from which the township took its name. The local history is sketched in very lightly, but what there is of it is well and accurately done. The second reason why the book deserves notice is because of its format. It is issued in a limited edition of 200 numbered copies, and it is printed, illustrated, and bound in the most admirable taste. Good printing has not been much studied in Canada until recently, and the type used in many Canadian imprints is still barbarous. Mr. Duff, by the books which he has been issuing from his private press, is setting a new standard for Canadian printing, and he deserves a warm recognition of this fact.

W. S. WALLACE

The Autobiography of a Teacher of French, with preliminary chapters from various sources. By JOHN SQUAIR. Toronto: The University of Toronto Press. 1928. Pp. 292.

As a contribution to educational history this book by the late Professor Squair has great value, and it also throws light upon some significant episodes in the history of the University of Toronto. For instance, the claim of the lecturers in Latin, French, German, and Italian and Spanish for admission to the University and College Councils with or without the status of professors, which was pressed in 1890 and finally admitted in 1892, is fully dealt with and reveals some negotiations with the provincial government not hitherto known. But not the least interesting feature

of the book is the frank disclosure it makes of Professor Squair himself. We see him as one who always did his own thinking, a man of independent judgment, but essentially sound and sane, never hasty to move but indomitably persistent when the time to move had come. The following calm summary which he gives of his University career admirably reflects the even temper and quiet modesty of the man, while at the same time showing that he fully realized and expected others to realize the great services he had rendered the University and the study of French. He has noted that from his appointment as fellow it was four years before he was given the title of lecturer, and five more before he became an associate professor, although in sole charge of his department from the first. He continues:

In these five stages [Fellow, Temporary Lecturer, Lecturer, Associate Professor, Professor] he did not once apply for a position. The Fellowship was offered to him, and he hesitated as to whether he should accept it. In the other four cases the positions came by promotion without application. But they did not come without waiting. Much patience was needed. But as he looks back the writer feels that the long waiting need not be considered remarkable. Looked at as men usually regard things of this kind, why should he have expected rapid promotion? His preparation was not of a distinguished kind. He went to no foreign university to study under any great master. He took what he could find in his own country, within her own institutions. After all, his *alma mater*, whom he sometimes complained of for her stepmotherly ways, turned out to be a pretty good mother, and he is glad he stayed under the old roof. He might have found worse places.

H. H. LANGTON

Mary's Rosedale and Gossip of "Little York." By ALDEN G. MEREDITH.

Ottawa: The Graphic Publishers. Pp. 280.

THIS volume is creditable to its publishers: it is well printed on good paper and well bound; the garish lining of its covers might offend some, but the jacket is becoming, and the "blurb" modest. The book is written in a light and pleasant style, wholly appropriate to the avowedly gossipy character of the content: as a piece of literature, it is successful; and no one looks for historical accuracy in a work of that character.

The "Mary" of the book is Mary, the elder daughter of William Dummer Powell, Jr., and the wife of William Botsford Jarvis, sheriff of the Home District. "Rosedale" is the home by the ravine in which she lived. The book is chiefly devoted to the story of her husband and of her and his families. Many letters are printed, from copies (generally) made by an early copying machine; few of these have been made public hitherto, and many of them throw a light not only on the doings of the Jarvises and Powells, but also on public affairs. Such materials are all too scarce; and these will be welcomed by those interested in early Upper Canada.

The story of Stephen Jarvis, of Sheriff Jarvis, of Jeremiah Powell, of the Fancy Dress Ball in 1838, in which the characters of the *Pickwick Papers* (published in 1837) were prominent, and the like, we find along with a first journey in a "Railcar", the Oregon question, the Rideau Canal, Trinity University, the Rebellion of 1837—all presented in an interesting style.

The proof-reading is not beyond reproach: the punctuation is erratic, and the syntax of a singular verb with a double conjunct subject, or of a plural verb with two disjunct singular subjects, is not unknown, while the orthography of proper nouns is unusual—we have "McCauley" for "Macaulay"; "Cavello" for "Cavallo"; "Tolpeddi" for "Tolpuddle" (or "Tolpiddle"); "FitzGibbon" and "Fitzgibbon", "Eston" for "Esten"; while the "Scotch malcontent" is always "MacKenzie." Were this history and not gossip, it might be objected that some mistakes are made, *e.g.*, William Dummer Powell was not chief justice of Upper Canada or a man of power there in 1827, nor did he travel in Spain in 1808 as chief justice of Upper Canada: he did not become chief justice till 1816, and he resigned in 1825, after having lost all his influence. He was not in Canada in 1827: nor did he go "to England after his . . . daughter Anne" in 1815 or at any time; she sailed to meet him when he was in England in 1822, and was drowned. His work was not and could not be carried on by his son John during his absence in Spain; and his early life had nothing of a struggle—he was a rich man's son and educated as such. His son, William Dummer Powell, Jr., did not take part in founding the Law Society at York; he did not live at Stamford, Conn., but at Stamford, Upper Canada, and he did not die after the birth of his second child. Jeremiah Powell was not a prisoner in Spain; the heads of his comrades in Miranda's expedition did not "decorate the Spanish ships"; he did not sail from New York for Curaçao. The engagement between the *Chesapeake* and the *Shannon* did not take place in 1807, but in 1813—but why continue? This is a work of gossip, not of history, and when did gossip care for accuracy?

The work deserves a place in every Canadian library—having been first furnished with a liberal page of *errata*, or a warning not to take its statements for historical fact.

WILLIAM RENWICK RIDDELL

Uren Prehistoric Village Site, Oxford County, Ontario. By W. J. WINTEMBERG. (Department of Mines, National Museum of Canada, Bulletin No. 51, Anthropological Series No. 10.) Ottawa. 1928. Pp. 97; illustrations.

THE historian who seeks to follow the paths of the early explorers in

Canada cannot neglect a study of the Indians; the white pioneers lived with the natives, their freedom to traverse new lands depended upon their dusky companions, successful trade required willingness and ability on the part of the aborigines to provide furs, alliances had to be made and hostile agreements checked; in fact, it may be said that for several hundred years the Indian was the dominant factor in Canadian history. To evaluate this factor, however, it must be remembered that the culture of the tribes in various parts of the country differed so fundamentally that the conditions affecting the work of explorers were never identical. Unfortunately, few of the early writers have left detailed accounts of these conditions, so the historian must supplement written records with those dug from the ground.

This volume is an excellent example of the kind of archaeological work that throws light on life in Ontario prior to European discovery, and, accordingly, on the life in which the Jesuit fathers and other French explorers participated. Wintemberg has carefully investigated part of a single village site in Oxford county, and by a detailed analysis of minute fragments has been able to reconstruct many of the activities of the inhabitants. Kernels of corn and sunflower seeds prove horticulture; 3,360 broken bones not only show that animals and birds were important articles of diet, but indicate the relative frequency in which the species were used; bone tools predominate over stone though many chips of the latter show that local manufacture occurred; pipes indicate the smoking of tobacco; while beads, charms, and ornaments show that aesthetic and religious aspects of life were not overlooked. In the twentieth century we are so accustomed to metal that we are apt to forget the craftsmanship required in working stone, bone, or antler; Mr. Wintemberg, by a careful study of the actual specimens, shows that no less than eleven processes were employed. For cultural analysis, potsherds are always valuable, and he has studied some 6,000 fragments both with respect to manufacture and design. Pottery decorations, the deep deposits indicative of semi-sedentary life, the presence of horticultural products, and a few other clues lead the author to believe that this site is that of a proto-Neutral village, perhaps one of the earliest Iroquoian settlements in Ontario.

Anthropologists and historians alike will welcome this volume, both for its own value, and as an indication of the resumption of anthropological publications by the Department of Mines. Prior to 1916, a considerable number of excellent monographs and papers, prepared by members of the Anthropological Division, were printed, and are now widely used as authoritative works on the Indians of Canada. Between that date and the appearance of the present volume, however, only one

paper has appeared; it is to be hoped that this important branch of research, carried on by the government, will be vigorously prosecuted. Indian culture is rapidly disappearing, and every effort should be made to record facts of historical and ethnological value before it is too late.

T. F. McILWRAITH

The Canada Year Book: The Official Statistical Annual of the Resources, History, Institutions, and Social and Economic Conditions of the Dominion. [Dominion Bureau of Statistics]. Ottawa: The King's Printer. 1928. Pp. xxxiv, 1100.

As is stated in the preface of this volume, the *Canada Year Book* had its origin in the first year of the Dominion. It is only in recent years, however, that the book, issue after issue, has become increasingly interesting. At the present time it supplies a wealth of information about Canada well able to satisfy the most ambitious students of Canadian economics. The first chapter describes the geographical features of Canada, its geological formation, the flora and fauna, the natural resources, as well as the climatic conditions prevailing over this vast territory. A short historical sketch follows this description. The two subsequent chapters are devoted to the constitution and government of Canada, and to the growth and distribution of population. The largest part of the book is devoted to the economic development of Canada, and analyses carefully, and in the most interesting fashion, the production of agriculture, the forests, fisheries, and mines, as well as trade and commerce (external and internal). Numerous tables and graphs illustrate the past and present development of these resources and the trade derived therefrom. Hydro-electric power developments and possibilities and the growth of manufacturing production since Confederation form the subject of another chapter. Very interesting data are provided as to the actual progress of Canada, which in the main follow the classification adopted by the decennial census of manufactures, the last of which was taken in 1921, but contain the preliminary results of the census of manufactures for 1926. Although giving the provincial distribution and importance of our manufacturing production, these chapters might be rendered more useful for the study of Canadian economic development if a more complete geographical distribution of manufactures was indicated, giving for each province, the localities in which the principal industries are established and the influence of environment, transportation facilities, and other favourable conditions, on this distribution. The two chapters on commerce and transportation are the best compendium of statistics available as to the general trend and progress of Canadian commerce. It must be said,

however, that here also, to make these statistics more comprehensive and to facilitate comparisons, it might be useful to state more generally the total quantities of commodities imported and exported instead of tabulating only the value of these goods; definition should also be given as to what is meant, for each class of goods, by manufactured and semi-manufactured products. Attention should be drawn to the significance of per capita trade, principally when used in tables (such as at page 490) for comparisons with similar estimates of other countries. Such statistics, it is evident, may be misleading if used to compare Canada's trade with that of countries where similar economic conditions do not prevail. The other chapters of this excellent book deal with labour and wages, wholesale and retail prices of commodities, public finance, currency and banking, insurance, loan and trust companies, education, public health and benevolence, administration, and a few other less important subjects. A bibliography of official publications (federal and provincial) containing information as to the current state of Canada is also given.

The *Canada Year Book, 1927-28* is one of the most important publications of the Canadian government. It compares favourably with similar publications of other countries, and its editor and compilers deserve the highest praise for their valuable work.

HENRY LAUREYS

RECENT PUBLICATIONS RELATING TO CANADA

(Notice in this section does not preclude a later and more extended review.)

I. THE RELATIONS OF CANADA WITHIN THE EMPIRE

BELL, KENNETH N., and MORRELL, W. P. (eds.). *Select documents on British colonial policy, 1830-1860*. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press. 1928. Pp. xlix, 610. (\$7.50.)

Reviewed on page 67.

DE MONTGOMERY, B. G. *Pax Britannica*. London: Methuen and Company. 1928. Pp. x, 249.

Reviewed on page 69.

SMITH, TREVOR. *The four dominions*. London: Selwyn and Blount. 1927. Pp. 76. (2s. 6d.)

Reviewed on page 69.

SOWARD, F. H. *Canada's new international responsibilities* (Contemporary Review, November, 1928, pp. 594-9).

An address delivered at the Institute of International Affairs, at the University of Washington, Seattle, which outlines some of the features of Canada's recently acquired autonomy.

TOYNBEE, ARNOLD J. *The conduct of British Empire foreign relations since the peace settlement*. Oxford: University Press; London: Humphrey Milford. 1928. Pp. viii, 119.

Reviewed on page 69.

II. HISTORY OF CANADA

(1) General History

BOLTON, HERBERT EUGENE. *History of the Americas: A syllabus with maps*. Boston: Ginn and Company. 1928. Pp. xxii, 314.

Reviewed on page 70.

GULLOCK, Mrs. W. C. *Governors of Canada* (Women's Canadian Historical Society of Ottawa: Transactions, 1928, pp. 39-54).

A paper giving tabloid accounts of the administrations of the governors of Canada from the early French period to the time of Lord Byng.

McKINLEY, MABEL BURNS. *Canadian heroines of pioneer days*. Toronto, London and New York: Longmans, Green and Co. 1929. Pp. 56.

Brief and entertaining biographies, the first volume of the "Maple Leaf Series" of books on Canadian biography for children.

MACLEOD, WILLIAM CHRISTIE. *The American Indian frontier*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf. 1928. Pp. xxiii, 598.

Reviewed on page 73.

SAGE, WALTER. *Some aspects of the frontier in Canadian history* (Canadian Historical Association Report, 1928, pp. 62-72).

A discussion of the applicability to Canadian history of Professor F. J. Turner's teaching in regard to the frontier.

WETHERELL, J. E. *Three centuries of Canadian story: From John Cabot to John Franklin*. Toronto: The Musson Book Co. Ltd. 1928. Pp. x, 338. (\$2.50.)

A series of stories from the by-ways of Canadian history narrated in an interesting fashion.

(2) New France

DESBARATS, MRS. G. J. *Some pioneer women of French Canada* (Women's Canadian Historical Society of Ottawa: Transactions, 1928, pp. 114-135).

Vivid incidents in the lives of Mère Marie de l'Incarnation, Jeanne Mance, Marguerite Bourgeoys, Madelaine de Verchères and Madame d'Youville.

FULLER, J. F. C. *The fortress of Quebec* (Journal of the Society of Army Historical Research, October, 1928, pp. 241-3).

An instructive note on the financial history of the fortifications of Quebec.

GARRAGHAN, GILBERT J. *New light on old Cahokia* (Illinois Catholic Historical Review, October, 1928, pp. 99-146).

The history of the missionary enterprises among the Tamarva Indians, 1698-1754, undertaken by the Seminary priests and the Jesuits, which gave rise to many controversies between the two orders.

LANCOT, GUSTAVE. *Les premiers budgets de la Nouvelle France* (Canadian Historical Association Report, 1928, pp. 27-33).

A brief account of early public finance in New France.

Lettre du Gouvernement de Callière au ministre (7 novembre, 1700) (Bulletin des Recherches Historiques, décembre, 1928, pp. 746-751).

An interesting document from the Archives of the province of Quebec dealing with a matter of military discipline.

LOWER, A. R. M. *The forest in New France* (Canadian Historical Association Report, 1928, pp. 78-90).

A useful chapter in the economic history of New France.

MOORE, IRENE. *Valiant La Vérendrye*. Quebec: King's Printer. 1927. Pp. 382.

Reviewed on page 63.

Précis du Voyage de Moy La Chauvignerie, Officier Interprète des Cinq Nations Iroquoises, détaché par ordre de Monsieur le Général pour porter sa parole aux Montagnes (Onontagués) (1728) (Bulletin des Recherches Historiques, décembre, 1928, pp. 740-745).

A copy of an official document in the possession of the provincial Archives at Quebec.

QUAIFE, M. M. *Detroit Biographies: Pierre Joseph Céloron* (Burton Historical Collection Leaflet, Vol. VII, No. 1.) Detroit: Detroit Public Library. Pp. 33-46.

A biographical outline of the life of Céloron, for fifty years an officer in New France. This is the third in a series of sketches of early Canadians, prominent in the history of Detroit.

WRONG, GEORGE M. *The rise and fall of New France*. Two volumes. Toronto: The Macmillan Co. of Canada. 1928. Pp. xviii, 925. (\$10.00.)

Reviewed on page 56.

(3) British North America before 1867

BEAUCHESNE, ARTHUR. *Lecture on the choice of Ottawa as the capital of Canada* (Women's Canadian Historical Society of Ottawa: Transactions, 1928, pp. 55-61).

A résumé of the parliamentary discussions on the choice of Canada's capital.

BREBNER, J. BARTLET. *Paul Mascarene of Annapolis Royal* (Dalhousie Review, January, 1929, pp. 501-516).

A study of the life of one of the early British officials in Nova Scotia, who was acting governor of the province from 1740 to 1749.

DE SALABERRY, COL. RENÉ. *The first state trial in Lower Canada* (Women's Canadian Historical Society of Ottawa: Transactions, 1928, pp. 136-146).

A summary of the proceedings at the trial of David MacLane who was indicted for high treason, condemned to death and executed in 1797.

- DOYLE, Mrs. J. C. *Sketch life of Thomas D'Arcy McGee* (Women's Canadian Historical Society of Ottawa: Transactions, 1928, pp. 147-151).

Salient features in the life of Thomas D'Arcy McGee, statesman, orator, and poet.

- DUFF, LOUIS BLAKE. *Crowland*. Welland, Canada: The Baskerville Press. 1928. Pp. 60.

Reviewed on page 81.

- EGERTON, HELEN MERRILL. *United Empire Loyalist literature* (The United Empire Loyalists' Association of Canada, Annual Transactions: 1917-1926, pp. 15-18).

An article reprinted from the *Toronto Mail and Empire* dealing with sources of information about United Empire Loyalists.

- FOBES, SIMON. *Journal of a member of Arnold's expedition to Quebec (1775)* (Magazine of History, Extra Number, No. 130).

A graphic story of the innumerable hardships endured by those who took part in Arnold's celebrated campaign, as recorded in the diary of a Connecticut Yankee who was a member of the expedition.

- GRIFFIN, SELWYN P. *Adventure on the Niagara River* (Willison's Monthly, November, 1928, pp. 212-216).

Some stirring episodes in the life of an early Toronto merchant-trader.

- HILL, Mrs. J. R. *Early British Canadian heroines* (Women's Canadian Historical Society of Ottawa: Transactions, 1928, pp. 93-113).

Brief accounts of the lives of English-speaking women who came as pioneers to Canada.

- J. H. L. *The 33rd Regiment of Foot, 1771-1785* (Journal of the Society of Army Historical Research, October, 1928, pp. 243-7).

A description of a series of letters covering the entire period of the war of the American Revolution, which convey a vivid impression of the war as viewed by a keen, high-spirited young British officer.

- MARTIN, CHESTER. *Sir Edmund Head's first project of federation, 1851* (Canadian Historical Association Report, 1928, pp. 14-26).

An early proposal of federation, embodied in a secret memorandum prepared by Sir Edmund Head, then lieutenant-governor of New Brunswick, in 1851.

- NELSON, PETER. *Learned's expedition to the relief of Fort Stanwix* (Quarterly Journal of the New York State Historical Association, October, 1928, pp. 380-385).

An address delivered at the unveiling of a memorial to General Learned.

- RAUCH, JOHN G. and ARMSTRONG, NELLIE C. *A bibliography of the laws of Indiana, 1788-1927*. Indianapolis: Historical Bureau of the Indiana Library and Historical Department. 1928. Pp. xxix, 77. (\$1.00.)

A complete bibliography of the laws for the government of Indiana, in which is included a brief historical account of the various claims to sovereignty over this territory since the Treaty of Paris, 1763.

- SMITH, WILLIAM. *The reception of the Durham Report in Canada* (Canadian Historical Association Report, 1928, pp. 41-54).

A chapter in the history of public opinion in Canada.

- WOOD, WILLIAM. *Select British Documents of the Canadian War of 1812. Volume III, Part II*. Toronto: The Champlain Society. 1928. Pp. 544-1061, xi.

Reviewed on page 64.

(4) **The Dominion of Canada**

BREITFUSS, LEONID. *Territorial division of the Arctic* (Dalhousie Review, January, 1929, pp. 456-470).

Suggestions regarding the most desirable distribution of sovereignty in the Arctic regions.

BROWN, Sir GEORGE McLAREN. *Canada's pageant of progress* (Royal Empire Society Diamond Jubilee No., 1928, pp. 25-31).

A résumé of Canada's economic and national expansion in the last sixty years.

COWAN, G. G. *The celebration of the Diamond Jubilee of Confederation* (Women's Canadian Historical Society of Ottawa: Transactions, 1928, pp. 62-73).

An outline by the honorary secretary of the National Diamond Jubilee Committee of the official celebrations throughout Canada.

CURRAN, W. TEES. *The riches of Canada's North* (United Empire, November, 1928, pp. 619-624).

An article describing the material assets of northern Ontario and Quebec.

DEMANCHE, GEORGES. *Cinquante années de peuplement: Canada*. Paris: Editions Spes. 1928. Pp. 148.

A discussion of the growth and distribution of population in Canada from Confederation to the present day.

FAY, SIDNEY BRADSHAW. *The origins of the World War*. Two Vols. New York: The Macmillan Co. 1928. Pp. xxii, 551; xvi, 577. (\$10.50.)

Reviewed on page 67.

KING, FRANCIS, K. C. *The problem of the upper St. Lawrence* (Queen's Quarterly, winter, 1929. Pp. 1-19).

A discussion of the tangled problem of the St. Lawrence development.

MARION, S. *Canadian unity and Quebec* (Women's Canadian Historical Society of Ottawa Transactions: 1928, pp. 170-185).

A paper stressing the idea that co-operation is essential to the success of Confederation.

MONTPETIT, ÉDOUARD. *French-Canadian co-operation* (Revue Trimestrielle Canadienne, décembre, 1928, pp. 425-439).

The first of a series of three lectures delivered at Mount Allison University, dealing with the necessity of preserving harmony between English and French Canadians in order to achieve national unity.

PATERSON, ALEXANDER P. *The true story of Confederation*. 2nd edition; with addenda containing original confederation treaty. St. John: Government of the Province of New Brunswick. 1926. Pp. 54.

A critical examination of the terms and spirit of Confederation.

STAPLES, LILA. *The Honourable Alexander Morris: The man; his work* (Canadian Historical Association Report, 1928, pp. 91-100).

A biographical sketch of an important figure in Canadian history during and after Confederation.

THOMPSON, BRAM. *Canada's national status*. (Reprinted from The Canadian Bar Review, December, 1928.) Regina: The author. 1928. Pp. 14.

The writer's hypothesis is that Canada really attained the status of an autonomous entity by the terms of the British North America Act of 1867.

WALKER, J. BRUCE. *Seeking successful settlers* (United Empire, January, 1929, pp. 26-31).

An address delivered by the director of European immigration for Canada at a meeting of the Royal Empire Society, which strongly stresses the advisability of a large annual migration to Canada from the Motherland.

III. PROVINCIAL AND LOCAL HISTORY

(1) The Maritime Provinces

HOWE, JOSEPH E. *Quit-rents in New Brunswick* (Canadian Historical Association Report, 1928, pp. 55-61).

An account of an unpopular tax levied in New Brunswick during the first third of the nineteenth century.

RIFE, CLARENCE W. *Edward Winslow, junior: Loyalist pioneer in the Maritime provinces* (Canadian Historical Association Report, 1928, pp. 101-112).

A sketch of the life of a prominent Loyalist of New Brunswick.

STEWART, JOHN A. *Notes on the arms of Nova Scotia*. Glasgow: The author. 1928. Pp. 48.

The history of the arms of Nova Scotia amplified from a brochure, first published some years ago as a protest against the use of a modern and superfluous coat of arms, which have now been replaced by the old arms.

STEWART, Judge W. S. *Cross currents influencing the Island's decision as to Union with Canada* (Supplement to the McGill News, December, 1928, pp. 23-30).

The first of a series of articles on the causes for Prince Edward Island joining the Dominion of Canada.

(2) The Province of Quebec

BELLEMARE, L'Abbé Jos.-ELZ. *Histoire de Nicolet 1669-1924: Première partie: La Seigneurie*. Arthabaska: L'Imprimerie d'Arthabaska. 1924.

To be reviewed later.

BERTRAND, CAMILLE. *Concession des terres du Bas-Canada, 1796 à 1840* (Canadian Historical Association Report, 1928, pp. 73-77).

Notes on land grants in Lower Canada between 1796 and 1840.

MASSICOTTE, E.-Z. *Noms de rues, localités, etc., dans la région de Montréal* (Bulletin des Recherches Historiques, décembre, 1928, pp. 731-2).

Additional notes to the series published from time to time giving information about the local history of Montreal.

NOBBS, PERCY E. *Montreal and town planning* (Supplement to the McGill News, December, 1928, pp. 12-17).

A statement showing how provincial legislation could combine the planning and zoning of the city for the benefit of the community.

TRAQUAIR, RAMSAY and BARBEAU, C. M. *The church of Saint Famille, Island of Orleans, Que.* (McGill University Publications, Series XIII, Art and Architecture, No. 13). Montreal: 1926. Pp. 13.

An historical and architectural description of the old church on the Island of Orleans, illustrated with plates and sketches, which has been reprinted from the Journal of the Royal Architectural Institute of Canada, May-June, 1926.

The church of St. François de Sales, Island of Orleans, Que. (McGill University Publications, series XIII, Art and Architecture, No. 14). Montreal: 1926. Pp. 13.

Another interesting outline of the historical and architectural features of one of the oldest churches in Quebec reprinted from the Journal of the Royal Architectural Institute of Canada, May-June, 1926.

(3) The Province of Ontario

CRUIKSHANK, Brig.-Gen. E. A. (ed.). *Niagara Historical Society: Records of Niagara, No. 39. 1784-7*. Niagara-on-the-Lake: Niagara Historical Society. 1928. Pp. 134.

An interesting collection of historical documents dealing largely with the disbanding of the regiments following the American war of Independence and the allotments of crown lands made to reduced officers, disbanded soldiers and Loyalists.

DAY, R. E. *Robert Rogers* (Quarterly Journal of the New York State Historical Association, October, 1928, pp. 395-397).

A brief summary of the life of the celebrated British scout.

ELLIS, W. W. *The village of Mount Pleasant* (The United Empire Loyalists' Association of Canada: Annual Transactions, 1917-1926, pp. 51-66).

The local history of a United Empire Loyalist settlement.

The golden book: Canadian Military Institute. Toronto: The Canadian Military Institute. [1928.] N.p.

A memorial of the members of the Canadian Military Institute, Toronto, who were killed in action during the Great War.

MEREDITH, ALDEN G. *Mary's Rosedale and gossip of "Little York."* Ottawa: The Graphic Publishers, Limited. 1928. Pp. 280. (\$2.50.)

Reviewed on page 82.

MIKEL, W. C. *Bay of Quinté reminiscences* (The United Empire Loyalists' Association of Canada: Annual Transactions, 1917-1926, pp. 87-98).

An address delivered to a meeting of United Empire Loyalists depicting scenes from the local history of the Bay of Quinté district.

SCOTT, MARY McKAY. *Some historic buildings in Ottawa* (Women's Canadian Historical Society of Ottawa: Transactions, 1928, pp. 81-92).

A paper giving brief descriptions of Ottawa's most famous buildings and their history.

SPICER, STERLING L. *Settlement of the District of Johnstown by United Empire Loyalists* (The United Empire Loyalists' Association: Annual Transactions, 1917-1926, pp. 102-108).

A detailed account of the first settlers in the Johnstown district.

THORNBURN, Mrs. C. H. *Ottawa: 1867-1927* (Women's Canadian Historical Society of Ottawa: Transactions, 1928, pp. 5-29).

Sidelights on the development of the capital city and the changes in men and manners during the past fifty years.

YOUNG, A. H. *Land grants in Upper Canada* (The United Empire Loyalists' Association of Canada: Annual Transactions, 1917-1926, pp. 76-86).

Some interesting light on the allotment of lands to Loyalists and their families and the abuses of the system.

(4) The Western Provinces

BOLTON, HERBERT EUGENE. *Fray Juan Crespi: Missionary explorer on the Pacific coast, 1769-1774*. Berkeley: University of California. 1927. Pp. 402.

Reviewed on page 70.

The Cree Rebellion of 1884, or Sidelights on Indian conditions subsequent to 1876 (Battleford Historical Society Publications: Chapters in the North-West History prior to 1890, related by Old Timers, Vol. I, No. 1, pp. xvi, 69).

The incidents leading up to the Cree rebellion as narrated by officials and as recorded in the newspapers and government reports.

DEAVILLE, ALFRED STANLEY. *The colonial postal systems and postage stamps of Vancouver Island and British Columbia, 1849-1871*. (Archives of British Columbia: Memoir No. VIII.) Victoria, B.C.: The King's Printer. 1928. Pp. 210.

Reviewed on page 77.

DOUGHTY, A. G. *The awakening of Canadian interest in the Northwest* (Canadian Historical Association Report, 1928, pp. 5-11).

Presidential address at the meeting of the Canadian Historical Association in 1928.

GOCKEL, Dr. A. *Die Landwirtschaft in den Prärie-provinzen West-Kanadas*. Berlin: Paul Parey. 1928. Pp. 140; maps. (M. 7.50.)

Reviewed on page 78.

HOWAY, F. W. *British Columbia: The making of a province*. Toronto: The Ryerson Press. 1928. Pp. x, 289. (\$3.00.)

Reviewed on page 75.

[HUDSON'S BAY COMPANY.] *Sir George Simpson centennial celebration, Fort St. James, 17th September, 1928. Unveiling of Tablet, Simpson Pass on the High Road from Banff to Windermere, B.C., 10th September, 1928*. Hudson's Bay Company. 1928. Pp. 48.

A copy of the addresses delivered at the centennial ceremonies in honour of Sir George Simpson, for forty years the head of the Hudson's Bay Company in Canada.

KEENLEYSIDE, HUGH L. *British Columbia—annexation or confederation?* (Canadian Historical Association, 1928, pp. 34-40).

An account of the critical period in the history of British Columbia which preceded its entrance into the Dominion of Canada in 1871.

McWILLIAMS, MARGARET. *Manitoba milestones*. Toronto and London: J. M. Dent and Sons, Ltd. 1928. Pp. xiv, 249. (\$2.00.)

To be reviewed later.

MORICE, A.-G. *Une jeune paroisse de l'ouest: Saint-Front, Saskatchewan* (Canada français, janvier, 1929, pp. 322-336).

The first part of a complete history of a small western town, tracing its growth, and the various vicissitudes of its existence during its early years.

OLIVER, Hon. FRANK. *The Indian drum: An incident in the Rebellion of 1885* (Queen's Quarterly, Winter, 1929, pp. 20-30).

A narrative account of the last Indian rising near Edmonton in 1885.

PERRY, M. EUGENIE. *A visit to Leechtown, Vancouver Island's deserted mining camp* (United Empire, November, 1928, pp. 634-637).

A description of the history and ruins of a town which was the scene of a gold rush in 1864, and now consists of one house.

ROSENBERG, FRANTZ. *Big game shooting in British Columbia and Norway*. London: Martin Hopkinson and Co. 1928. Pp. ix, 261. (25s.)

A portion of this book relates a hunter's experiences in British Columbia.

The story of the press (Canadian North-West Historical Society Publications: Chapters in the North-West History Prior to 1890, related by Old Timers, Vol. I, No. 4, Part I, pp. 106).

A collection of papers which throw valuable light on the men and methods of journalism in its early days in the Western provinces.

WATSON, ROBERT. *Fort St. James* (The Beaver, December, 1928, pp. 101-103).

The history of an historic Hudson's Bay Company post in terms of the celebrated men whose names are associated with it.

WICKERSHAM, JAMES. *A bibliography of Alaskan literature*. Cordova, Alaska: Cordova Daily Times. 1928. Pp. xxvii, 635.

Reviewed on page 79.

WINTERS, Brig.-Gen. C. F. *Recollections of the North-West Rebellion of 1885* (Women's Canadian Historical Society of Ottawa: Transactions, 1928, pp. 30-38).

The story of the Indian rising told by a member of the company from the Governor-General's Foot Guards which was sent from Ottawa to help to quell the rebellion.

IV. GEOGRAPHY, ECONOMICS, AND STATISTICS

AUER, VÄINÖ. *Stratigraphical and morphological investigations of peat bogs of southeastern Canada*. (Communicationes Inst. Quaest. Forest. Finlandiae: No. 12.) Helsingfors. 1927. Pp. 62; map and illustrations.

The first stratigraphic study of peat bogs in Canada.

BODILLY, Commander R. B., R.N. *The Voyage of Captain Thomas James for the discovery of the North-west Passage, 1631*. London and Toronto: J. M. Dent and Sons, Ltd. 1928. Pp. 216.

Reviewed on page

BREWER, HENRY BRIDGMAN. *The Log of the Lausanne—III: Notes and Comments by John M. Cause* (Oregon Historical Quarterly, December, 1928, pp. 347-362).

Further extracts from the log of the ship Lausanne, dealing with the trip from Honolulu to Vancouver, in the year 1840.

BROWN, GEORGE W. *Some aspects of the St. Lawrence deepening project* (Journal of the Canadian Bankers' Association, January, 1929, pp. 177-185).

An outline of the discussion which has taken place with reference to the St. Lawrence deepening scheme.

CAHAN, C. H. *The St. Lawrence waterways* (Dalhousie Review, January, 1929, pp. 490-499).

A discussion of the issues involved in the proposed St. Lawrence waterways scheme.

[CANADA: DOMINION BUREAU OF STATISTICS]. *The Canada year book, 1927-28; The official statistical annual of the resources, history, institutions, and social and economic conditions of the Dominion*. Ottawa: The King's Printer. 1928. Pp. xxxiv, 1100.

Reviewed on page 85.

CARUS-WILSON, E. M. *The merchant adventurers of Bristol in the fifteenth century* (Transactions of the Royal Historical Society, fourth series, vol. xi, 1928, pp. 61-82).

A valuable study throwing light on the background of the Cabot voyages.

ELLIOTT, T. C. *Journal of Captain Charles Bishop of the "Ruby" in 1795* (Oregon Historical Quarterly, December, 1928, pp. 336-346).

Some extracts from the log of this early navigator which refer to the trip to the coast of Oregon, published now for the first time, through the courtesy of the provincial archivist of British Columbia.

ENGLAND, ROBERT. *British immigration* (Queen's Quarterly, Winter, 1929, pp. 131-144).

A résumé of the economic and social conditions in Canada and Great Britain which make it difficult to stimulate British immigration.

FARQUHAR, GEORGE. *The Atlantic fisheries* (Queen's Quarterly, Winter, 1929, pp. 108-120).

Comments on the recommendation and results of the Royal Commission for the investigation of the fisheries of the Maritime Provinces and the Magdalen Islands.

- HURD, W. BURTON. *The case for a quota* (Queen's Quarterly, Winter, 1929, pp. 145-159).
A discussion of the social and political aspects of the immigration question which lead the writer to conclude that a restrictive policy is best for Canada.
- KIDD, M. WINNIFRED. *Canadian immigration* (Supplement to the McGill News, December, 1928, pp. 31-33).
A statement of Canada's immigration problem.
- LAMB, DAVID C. *What is wrong with migration?* (Empire Review, July, 1928, pp. 10-17).
A plea for British migration to the Dominions, in order to strengthen the imperial ties.
- McFEE, WILLIAM. *Sir Martin Frobisher*. (The Golden Hind Series.) London: John Lane. 1928. Pp. 288; maps and illustrations. (12s. 6d.)
Reviewed on page 61.
- MACKENZIE, CATHERINE. *Alexander Graham Bell: The man who contracted space*. Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1928. Pp. x, 382. (\$3.00.)
Reviewed on page 80.
- MELLANBY, KENNETH. *An expedition to Mackenzie River* (Discovery, January, 1929, pp. 18-21).
An account of an expedition made in the summer of 1928 to the delta of the Mackenzie River by two English scientists.
- MOBERLY, HENRY JOHN and CAMERON, WILLIAM BLEASDELL. *When fur was king*. London and Toronto: J. M. Dent and Sons. 1929. Pp. xviii, 237. (\$2.50.)
Reviewed on page 65.
- MURCHIE, R. W., and others. *Seasonal unemployment in Manitoba: A report*. [Winnipeg.] Legislative Assembly of the Province of Manitoba. 1928. Pp. 80.
The problem of the causes of unemployment during the winter season in Manitoba, and recommendations for its relief, are discussed in this report made at the request of the premier of Manitoba.
- PARKS, GEORGE BRONER. *Richard Hakluyt and the English voyages*. (American Geographical Society Special Publication No. 10.) New York: American Geographical Society. 1928. Pp. xviii, 289.
To be reviewed.
- PENDLETON, GEORGE. *Hudson's Bay Company explorers: Thomas Simpson, explorer of the western Arctic coast* (The Beaver, December, 1928, pp. 107-109).
A brief account of the career of another explorer in the ranks of the Hudson's Bay Company.
- TANGHE, RAYMOND. *Géographie humaine de Montréal*. (Documents Économiques, II: contribution à l'École des Sciences sociales, économiques et politiques de l'Université de Montréal.) Montréal: Librairie d'Action Canadienne-française. 1928. Pp. 334.
Reviewed on page 71.
- THORINGTON, J. MONROE. *The centenary of David Douglas' ascent of Mount Brown* (Canadian Alpine Journal, vol. XVI, pp. 185-197).
A consideration of the evidence for and against the probability of Douglas having really attained the summit of Mount Brown.
- WALLACE, J. N. *Eugène Bourgeau* (Canadian Alpine Journal, vol. XVI, pp. 177-184).
A sketch of the life of a member of Palliser's expedition, a pioneer in the field of botany, and the first botanist to examine the Rocky Mountains south of Athabasca Pass and the prairie south of North Saskatchewan River.

V. EDUCATIONAL AND RELIGIOUS HISTORY

ASHTON, Mrs. E. J. *The Jesuit missions at Fort Ste. Marie* (Women's Canadian Historical Society of Ottawa: Transactions, 1928, pp. 152-162).

A brief historical article on the trials of the missionaries and the discovery of the site of the first church building in Ontario.

BAILLIE, Very Rev. A. V., and others. *A joyous adventure in the Dominion of Canada*. London and Toronto: J. M. Dent and Sons, Ltd. 1928. Pp. viii, 191.

A record of the official visit to Canada in 1927 of the choirs from Westminster Abbey and St. George's Chapel, Windsor.

FENCL, LEONARD J. *The death of Father Jacques Marquette* (Illinois Catholic Historical Review, October, 1928, pp. 147-155).

An English version of the account of the death of Father Marquette which was first published in Latin by Rochemonteix in the third volume of his *Les Jésuites et la Nouvelle France au XVII^e Siècle*.

HARRIS, LAWREN. *Creative art in Canada* (Supplement to the McGill News, December, 1928, pp. 6-11).

One of Canada's creative artists discusses the reasons for the present trend of painting in Canada.

JOLLIFFE, Mrs. O. J. *Canadian arts and artists* (Women's Canadian Historical Society of Ottawa: Transactions, 1928, pp. 163-169).

A brief history of Canadian painters.

LAVEILLE, É. *Le P. de Smet: Apôtre des Peaux-rouges (1801-1873)*. Quatrième édition. Louvain and Paris: Museum Lessianum. 1928. Pp. xiv, 480.

To be reviewed later.

LECOMPTE, P. ÉDOUARD. *Le Père Louis Leboeuf de la Compagnie de Jésus, 1858-1926*. Montreal: Imprimerie du Messager. 1928. Pp. 151.

A biography by a fellow Jesuit of a Canadian missionary to "la Brousse Africaine."

MAURAUULT, OLIVIER. *Marges d'histoire: L'art au Canada* (Documents Historiques IV. Contribution de la Faculté des lettres de l'Université de Montréal, No. 1). Montréal: Librairie d'Action canadienne-française, 1929. Pp. 310.

To be reviewed later.

RIDDELL, Hon. WILLIAM RENWICK. *Status of Roman Catholicism in Canada* (Catholic Historical Review, October, 1928, pp. 305-328).

An account of the gradual extension of religious toleration and civil liberty to Roman Catholics in Canada from 1759, despite the hope expressed in Royal instructions that the new subjects "by degrees be induced to embrace the Protestant religion and their children be brought up in the principles of it."

TROTTER, REGINALD G. *Canadian interest in the history of the United States* (Queen's Quarterly, Winter, 1929, pp. 92-107).

A survey of the courses of instruction offered to students of the history of the United States in Canadian universities, and the achievements of Canadian scholars in this field.

